

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

modern language notes

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

PUBLIC LIBRARY

AUG 2 1957

DETROIT

VOL. LXXII, NO. 6, JUNE 1957

-
- 401 The Genesis of Michael Drayton's Ode "To the Virginian Voyage." GERHARD FRIEDRICH
- 406 Horatio's Report to Hamlet. W. EDWARD FARRISON
- 408 *Traitor in All's Well* and *Troilus and Cressida*. JAY LEON HALIO
- 410 An Instance of Milton's Use of Time. EDMUND REISS
- 412 Symbol and Meaning in "The Little Black Boy." JACOB H. ADLER
- 416 Wordsworth's *Prelude*: I, 1-269. CHARLES MOORMAN
- 421 The Gnomonic Clue to James Joyce's *Dubliners*.
GERHARD FRIEDRICH
- 424 The *Fool* in "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock."
MARGARET MORTON BLUM
- 426 Buddhistic Overtones in Eliot's *The Cocktail Party*.
R. BAIRD SHUMAN
- 427 Philostratus' *Imagines* and Alciato's *Emblemata*.
KARL LUDWIG SELIG
- 428 A Persian Source in Voltaire's *Lisbonne*. FRANCIS J. CROWLEY
- 431 Sainte-Beuve on Chateaubriand's Eyes. LORIN A. UFFENBECK
- 432 Der Schein von Héros Lampe. HEINZ POLITZER

REVIEWS

- 437 W. SCHRICKX, *Shakespeare's Early Contemporaries: The Background of the Harvey-Nashe Polemic and "Love's Labour's Lost"* (S. K. HENINGER, JR.)
- 439 ROBERT B. HEILMAN, *Magic in the Web: Action and Language in Othello* (JOHN ARTHOS)
- 442 WILLIAM W. APPLETON, *Beaumont and Fletcher: A Critical Study* (SAMUEL SCHOENBAUM)
- 444 G. E. BENTLEY, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage, Vols. III-IV* (G. B. HARRISON)
- 447 HARRIS FRANCIS FLETCHER, *The Intellectual Development of John Milton, Vol. I: The Institution to 1625: From the Beginnings through Grammar School* (WILLIAM R. PARKER)
- 451 GEORGE C. BRANAM, *Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearean Tragedy* (GEORGE W. STONE, JR.)
- 452 WILLIAM CLYDE DE VANE, *A Browning Handbook*, 2nd ed. (W. O. RAYMOND)
- 453 ELLEN DOUGLASS LEYBURN, *Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man* (ROBERT C. ELLIOTT)
- 456 MURRAY KRIEGER, *The New Apologists for Poetry* (MILTON C. NAHM)
- 461 GEORGE CARY, *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. D. J. A. ROSS (ALFRED FOULET)
- 463 MARGARET M. PELAN, ed., *Floire et Blancheflor, nouvelle édition* (RAPHAEL LEVY)
- 465 CHRÉTIEN DE TROYES, *Le Roman de Perceval, ou Le Conte du Graal*, ed. WILLIAM ROACH (EDWARD B. HAM)
- 467 LUIS VÉLEZ DE GUEVARA, *El Embuste acreditado*, ed. ARNOLD G. REICHENBERGER (JOHN M. HILL)
- 470 HENRIK BECKER, *Spottlied, Märchen und Heldenlied vom Rosengarten* (BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN)
- 471 GEORGE FENWICK JONES, transl., *Wittenwiler's Ring. Colkelbie Sow. Two Comic-Didactic Works from the Fifteenth Century* (EDWIN H. ZEYDEL)
- 474 HANS ZELLER, *Winckelmanns Beschreibung des Apollo im Belvedere* (WOLFGANG STECHOW)
- 476 ROBERT T. CLARK, JR., *Herder His Life and Thought* (HEINRICH SCHNEIDER)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
CLIFTON C. CHERPACK
STEFAN EINARSSON
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
HAROLD JANTZ
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
KARL LUDWIG SELIG
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$5.00 in the United States; \$6.25 in Canada; \$6.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.00. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md., Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress, 16 July 1894.

ey-

es)

M)

I:

CH

ic-

ugh

6.25

1.00.

ould

Md.

ipts

The

very

urn

are

Md.,

of

ress,

modern language notes

VOL. LXXII, NO. 6, JUNE 1957

The Genesis of Michael Drayton's Ode "To the Virginian Voyage"

One of Michael Drayton's most notable poems, the ode entitled "To the Virginian Voyage," addresses itself in the concluding stanza to Richard Hakluyt, the famous Elizabethan compiler of travel literature. The indebtedness of the middle half of Drayton's ode to Hakluyt's account of the Raleigh-sponsored "first voyage" to Virginia (1584) was demonstrated many years ago by Joseph Quincy Adams,¹ and the Adams study has been admirably complemented by Robert Cawley's demonstration how also Drayton's catalog of British voyagers and their achievements in the Nineteenth Song of *The Poly-Olbion* was based on Hakluyt.² But the case which Joseph Quincy Adams made with

¹ See Joseph Quincy Adams, "Michael Drayton's *To the Virginia* [sic] *Voyage*," *Modern Language Notes*, xxxiii, 7 (November, 1918), 405-408. Incidentally, in selecting his elements of fact and fable, Drayton was probably aided by such marginal glosses provided in his source book as: "A sweet smell from the land," "Abundance of grapes," "Goodly Cedars, Pynea, Cypres, Sassaphras," etc. See Richard Hakluyt, *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation* . . . (Glasgow, New York, 1904), viii, 298-300, 302. All subsequent references are to this reprint edition.

² See Robert Ralston Cawley, "Drayton and the Voyagers," *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxxviii, 3 (September, 1923), 530-556.

regard to Drayton's Virginia poem, though in itself illuminating, can still be considerably strengthened.³ First, it can be shown that even in the middle stanzas Drayton owed more to the "first voyage" than previously indicated. Secondly, there is evidence that Drayton drew also upon other Hakluyt items for his Virginia ode. And thirdly, the indebtedness to Hakluyt carries from the very first line of the poem, beyond the middle half, to the Apollo stanza and the concluding Hakluyt apostrophe—which needs to be elucidated and amplified. These major additions to Adams's particular source study can be documented as follows:

"... if his motives be derived from a vertuous & heroycall minde, preferring chiefly the honour of God . . . advancement of his honest and well disposed countrey men, willing to accompany him in such honourable actions . . . all these be honorable purposes. . . ." (Hakluyt, VIII, 36)

"... I doubt not but that all good mindes will endeavour themselves to be assistants to this so commendable an enterprise, by the valiant and worthy Gentlemen our Countrey men already attempted and undertaken . . . to maintaine, pursue and follow this intended voyage already in part performed. . . ." (Hakluyt, VIII, 93-94)

You brave Heroique Minds,
Worthy your Countries Name,
That Honour still pursue. . . . (Drayton, lines 1-3)

"Many voyages have bene pretended, yet hitherto never any thorowly accomplished by our nation . . . into . . . those maine, ample and vast countreys . . . neither hath a right way bene taken of planting a Christian habitation and regiment upon the same, as well may appeare both by the little we yet do actually possesse therein, & by our ignorance of the riches and secrets within those lands, which unto this day we know chiefly by the travell and report of other nations, and most of the French, who albeit they . . . neither these many yeeres have had opportunity nor meanes so great to discover and to plant . . . as we have had by the inestimable benefit of our long and happy peace: yet have they both waies performed more . . . if with like diligence the search of inland countreys had bene followed . . . no doubt her Majesties territories . . . had bene mightily enlarged. . . ." (Hakluyt, VIII, 34-35)

"... when the shipping was in a maner prepared, & men ready upon the coast to go aboard: at that time some brake consort, and followed courses degenerating from the voyage before pretended: Others failed of their promises contracted, and the greater number were dispersed, leaving the Generall with few of his assured friends, with whom he adventured to sea. . . ." (Hakluyt, VIII, 40)

³ *The Works of Michael Drayton*, ed. J. William Hebel, v: *Introductions, Notes, Variant Readings*, ed. Kathleen Tillotson & Bernard H. Newdigate (Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1941), p. 147 goes beyond Adams's own claim in asserting: "A complete list of parallels has been set out by J. Q. Adams."

"Time went away without any thing done by his assignes. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 41)

" . . . which the more doth aggravate the fault and foolish slouth in many of our nation, chusing rather to live indirectly, and every miserably to live & die within this realme . . . then to adventure as becommeth men, to obtaine an habitation in those remote lands, in which Nature very prodigally doth minister unto mens endeavours. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 60)

" . . . while wee this long time have stood still and have bene idle lookers on, making courtisie who should give the first adventure, or once being given, who should continue or prosecute the same."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 162)

Britans, you stay too long,

Quickly aboard bestowe you. . . . (Drayton, lines 7-8)

Goe, and subdue,

Whilst loyt'ring Hinds⁴

Lurke here at home, with shame. (Drayton, lines 4-6)

" . . . we never had faire day without fogge or raine, and windes bad . . . the winds are commonly West towards the Newfound land, keeping ordinarily within two points of West to the South or to the North. . . . Before we come to Newfound land . . . we passe the banke, which are high grounds rising within the sea and under water, yet deepe enough and without danger. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 48)

Your course securely steere,

West and by South forth keepe,

Rocks Lee-shores, nor Sholes,

When EOLUS scowles,

You need not feare,

So absolute the Deepe.

(Drayton, lines 13-18)

" . . . the voyage and successe thereof, attempted in . . . 1583 by sir Humfrey Gilbert. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 34)

"Let us therefore with cheerefull minds and couragious hearts, give the attempt, and leave the sequell to almightie God: for if he be on our part, what forceth it who bee against us?"

(Hakluyt, VIII, 131)

And cheerefully at Sea,

Successe you still intice. . . . (Drayton, lines 19-20)

"They found the same . . . replenished with Beasts and great store of Foule of divers kinds: And Fish of sundry sortes . . . in so great plentie as might suffice to victuall an Armie, and they are very easily taken."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 90)

" . . . fat Bucks, Conies, Hares, Fish the best of the world."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 304)

" . . . sodden Venison, and roasted, fish sodden, boyled, and roasted. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 305)

⁴ Perhaps also in contrast with "The Golden Hind(e)" of the Hakluyt account chiefly quoted here?

Where Nature hath in store
Fowle, Venison, and Fish. . . .
Without your Toyle . . .
All greater then your Wish.

(Drayton, lines 25-26, 28, 30)

" . . . their Countrey corne . . . groweth three times in five moneths. . . ."
(Hakluyt, VIII, 304)

Three Harvests more. . . . (Drayton, line 29)

"Sassafras . . . is found by experience to be far better and of more uses then the wood which is called Guaiacum, or Lignum vitæ. For the description, the maner of using, and the manifold vertues thereof, I refer you to the booke of Monardes, translated and entituled in English, The joyfull newes from the West Indies."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 355)

And use-full Sassafras. (Drayton, line 36)

" . . . they caused forthwith to be discharged all the great Ordinance of their fleete in token of our welcome."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 52)

" . . . for the joy of whose comming our ships discharged their ordinance. . . ."
(Hakluyt, VIII, 311)

O you the happy'st men,
Be Frolicke then,
Let Cannons roare. . . . (Drayton, lines 51-53)

" . . . to discover and to plant Christian inhabitants . . . upon those large and ample countreys extended Northward from the cape of Florida, lying under very temperate Climes. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 34)

" . . . the French did but review that before discovered by the English nation, usurping upon our right, and imposing names upon countreys, rivers, bayes, capes, or headlands, as if they had bene the first finders of those coasts. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 37)

And in Regions farre
Such *Heroes* bring ye forth,
As those from whom We came,
And plant Our name,
Under that Starre
Not knowne unto our North. (Drayton, lines 55-60)

" . . . the most part of their underwoods are Bayes and such like. . . ."
(Hakluyt, VIII, 304)

* Adams went unnecessarily far afield with his "fish" reference, while ignoring others in the context of pages 298-305 of the Hakluyt volume which he generally credited as Drayton's source. However, the abundance of fish, fowl, and venison, as well as of the more alluring gold and pearls, is stressed numerous times in the *Voyages*. See, for example the "gold"-studded pages, Hakluyt, VIII, 125-126, and the "pearl"-studded counterpart, 323-324. Gold and pearls are even listed together several times, twice on p. 95, and once in the order of Drayton's poem (as also later in "Of His Ladies Not Comming to London," line 103) on p. 118.

"Ascopo a kinde of tree very like unto Lawrell. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 372)

" . . . they aske counsel, as the Romans were woont of the Oracle of Apollo. They sing songs as they march towards the battell in stead of drummes and trumpets. . . ."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 308)

"Amongst whom was drowned a learned man . . . who of pietie and zeale to good attempts, adventured in this action, minding to record in the Latine tongue, the gests and things worthy of remembrance, happening in this discoverie, to the honour of our nation, the same being adorned with the eloquent stile of this Orator, and rare Poet of our time."

(Hakluyt, VIII, 67)

And as there Plenty growes

Of Lawrell every where,

APOLLO's Sacred tree,

You it may see,

A Poets Browes

To crowne, that may sing there.* (Drayton, lines 61-66)

Certain of the Hakluyt passages cited above pinpoint what appear to be the immediate origins of phrases incorporated in Drayton's ode "To the Virginian Voyage." In other instances such precise correlation is not possible, because of the multiplicity of corresponding references in Hakluyt. Indeed, Drayton's adoption of specific objects, attitudes, and ideas seems often to have been the cumulative result of his reading in Hakluyt, rather than merely the reflection of any one particular statement. From Sir Humfrey Gilbert's 1583 voyage to Newfoundland to Thomas Harriot's "A briefe and true report of the new found land of Virginia" (1587), he culled freely from Hakluyt's pages such facts, experiences, sentiments, and hopes as would serve his purpose to compose a vivid and vigorous paean to the expansionism of his age as exemplified in the renewed attempt to establish a permanent British colony on American soil.

The full extent to which Drayton's Virginia ode is—literally and in spirit—Hakluyt versified, is however not realized unless one recalls that Hakluyt was himself a prime mover in connection with the Virginia voyage of 1606. The last stanza of Drayton's ode, particularly the phrasing:

Thy Voyages attend,
Industrious HACKLUYT,

embodies certainly not only the meaning of continuing to bring

*For an extension of this sentiment see Drayton's "To Master George Sandys, Treasurer for the English Colony in Virginia," lines 37-44.

together and publicize the records of British seafaring;⁷ it has also reference to the fact of Hakluyt's exerting himself in behalf of the Jamestown expedition,⁸ and it reflects besides the eulogizing poet's identification and debt.

Haverford College

GERHARD FRIEDRICH

Horatio's Report to Hamlet

On the morning following their joint midnight encounter with the ghost of the late King Hamlet, Horatio, Marcellus, and Bernardo go to tell Prince Hamlet about it. They find him in the council chamber in the royal palace soliloquizing mainly against the recent "o'erhasty marriage" of his mother. (*Hamlet*, I, ii, 160 ff.). During the conversation that ensues, Hamlet, whose reflections on contemporary affairs in Denmark invariably lead him back to the memory of his father, astonishes Horatio with the remark, "My father!—Methinks I see my father." Wondering momentarily whether the ghost is now present but visible only to Hamlet, Horatio excitedly inquires, "Oh, where, my lord?" Upon sensing Horatio's amazement, though he does not yet know its cause, Hamlet answers, "In my mind's eye, Horatio"; whereupon Horatio makes the statement, "I saw him once, he was a goodly king." The Second Quarto of *Hamlet*, like the first one, has a comma after "once"; the First Folio has a semicolon after it.

In the light of Horatio's explanation to Marcellus the preceding night after he first saw the ghost (I, i, 59-63) and of his telling Hamlet emphatically near the end of the morning's conversation that he knew the late king too well to be mistaken about the identity of the ghost (I, ii, 211 ff.), the first half of the last-quoted line makes little or no sense punctuated as it is in either the quartos or the First Folio. Neither the punctuation in the former nor that in the latter is neces-

⁷ Accounts of the successful enterprise were eventually included in *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas his Pilgrimes* (1625).

⁸ *Poemes Lyrick and pastorall*, in which "To the Virginian Voyage" was first printed, was entered in the Stationers' Register April 19, 1606. The patent for the plantation of Virginia had been granted but a few days earlier, on April 10, 1606, with Richard Hakluyt listed prominently among the petitioners and patentees.

sarily either Shakespeare's or representative of the Elizabethan stage reading. They may be the handiwork of scribes or proofreaders and, therefore, are not beyond question.¹

If carefully considered in its context, the line may be clarified by a simple change in its punctuation. Hamlet's simultaneous view of nothing in the void and talk about seeing his father in his mind's eye must be quite perturbing to Horatio, who remembers all too vividly the "dreaded sight" of the preceding night. As a result Horatio impulsively says, "I saw him—" but realizing before finishing his statement that he has begun it with more positiveness than tact, he breaks it off. Once again he must guard against speaking too positively and too quickly, as he had to keep himself from doing once during the preceding night while talking with Marcellus. (I, i, 70-80.) In an attempt to conceal his discomfiture as well as to fill the hiatus he has created by breaking his statement off, he adds, perhaps in a tone fraught with regret, "once he was a goodly king." For the sake of clarity, then, the line may well be punctuated internally with only a dash after "him." Or if Shakespeare used commas as "light" punctuation to indicate readings "trippingly on the tongue," as he has been said to have done, the comma of the quartos probably belongs, not after "once," but after "him." In this position it would indicate at least approximately the kind of reading of the line which I have just ascribed to Horatio.

For Hamlet, much more than for Horatio, the second half of the line is significant especially since nothing like it can be said of Claudius, the new king. This much is at least implied in what Hamlet says next: "He [King Hamlet] was a man, take him for all in all, / I shall not look upon his like again."

After this comment, Horatio, having regained his composure, says with studied self-control and in precisely chosen words, "My lord, I think I saw him yesternight." This line, it may be observed, is a perfect iambic pentameter, and the regularity of its stresses marks the deliberateness of Horatio's utterance. Obviously there is a contrast between this direct and clear statement and the confusing one of a few moments earlier.

¹ See J. Dover Wilson's *The Manuscript of Shakespeare's Hamlet and the Problems of Its Transmission*, Cambridge, 1934, I, 170-174, II, 192-215; his *Second Edition of Hamlet*, Cambridge, 1936 et seq., pp. xxvii-xxviii and xxxi-xxxii; and also Thomas Marc Parrott and Hardin Craig (Editors), *The Tragedy of Hamlet, A Critical Edition of the Second Quarto*, Princeton, 1938, pp. 46-47 and 56-57.

Although Hamlet now becomes somewhat emotional, Horatio remains calm and self-assured throughout the colloquy that follows, like the witness and reporter who knows what he is talking about. And when in describing the ghost he tells Hamlet, "I knew your father; / These hands are not more like," and explains a few moments later that the apparition's beard was, "as I have seen it in his life, / A sable silver'd," he justifies, I believe, the kind of emendation I have suggested for the line in which he has been made to say that he saw the late King Hamlet "once."

North Carolina College

W. EDWARD FARRISON

Traitor in All's Well and Troilus and Cressida

In Act II, scene 1, of *All's Well That Ends Well* the old lord Lafew introduces a shy and fearful Helena to the King of France with the following speech:

Lafew. Nay, come your waies,
This is his Maiestie, say your minde to him,
A Traitor you doe looke like, but such traitors
His Maiesty seldome feares, I am *Cresseds Vncle*,
That dare leave two together, far you well.

(2.1.97-101)

Lafew here plays upon two senses of the word *traitor*, a quibble (antanaclasio) not previously noted by the commentators: 'one guilty of treason' (OED 2) & 'a naughtie-packe; a lewd or wicked fellow' (Cotgrave), or, in this context, 'a light woman, a harlot.'¹ The reference to *Cresseds Vncle* makes the wordplay unmistakable; indeed, Lafew's appearance with Helena before the King is not unlike Pandarus' bringing Cressida to Troilus in TC 3.2.42 ff. Earlier in the play Helena uses the term *traitoress*, but she may be referring either to herself or to the women at court whom Bertram will meet. *There* in the quotation is vague since it apparently begins that part of the passage which has been clumsily "joined" to another textual

¹ See OED *naughty-pack* †1 'A woman of bad character.' Uses of the word in this sense are recorded 1530-1743; note especially 1600 Holland *Livy* 36.12.592: "A Capuan wench . . . , a naughty-pack and an harlot."

layer after cutting.² Parolles has just concluded his tirade on virginity:

Helena. Not my virginity yet:
There shall you Master have a thousand louses,
A Mother, and a Mistress, and a friend,
A Phenix, Captaine, and an enemy,
A guide, a Goddesse, and a Soueraigne,
A Counsellor, a Traitoresse, and a Dear. . . .

(1.1.179-184)

Traitoresse fits as well with *Soueraigne*, *Captaine*, and *enemy*—terms taken from the vocabulary of love-as-war which pervades the play (see, for example, the previous dialogue with Parolles, 1.1.122-146)—as with *Mistresse*, *Dear*, and perhaps *friend* (in the sense 'lover');³ hence this additional evidence is not conclusive. It relates rather to the origin of *traitor* 'naughty-pack' in the slightly less pejorative use of the word to describe agents in situations of betrayed love or even rape. *Traitor* in this sense can be traced back at least as early as Chaucer (MLT (B) 957, RR 4831-3) and is found often in Shakespeare in the plays and especially in *The Rape of Lucrece* (TC 1.1.31; TS 5.2.160; TA 5.2.178; RL 73, 361, 888, 1686).

With this information concerning *traitor* not hitherto brought to light, and Lafew's quibble consequently unrecognized, it is not surprising that editors should be puzzled by Pandarus' epilogue in *Troilus and Cressida*:

. . . oh world, world, world! thus is the poore agent dispisde: Oh traitours and bawdes; how earnestly are you set aworke, and how ill requited? why should our indeuour be so desir'd, and the performance so loath'd?

(5.10.36-40)

Believing *traitours* to be a misprint for *traders*, which appears a few lines further in the phrase *traders in the flesh* (line 46), W. J. Craig suggested the emendation adopted by Deighton in the old Arden edition of the play and by Kittredge among more recent editors. But emendation here, it now becomes clear, is hardly necessary, and we may retain the reading preserved in the Quarto and all four Folios.⁴

University of California (Davis)

JAY LEON HALIO

² See the discussion of this question by J. Dover Wilson in the New Cambridge edition of the play (Cambridge, 1929), p. 104. But cf. also Steevens' reply to Johnson's note.

³ Cf. Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

⁴ The material included in this article is part of a dissertation presented in June, 1956, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Yale University.

An Instance of Milton's Use of Time

Besides speaking of the creation of the world, Milton also discussed the place of time in the creative act. In an early minor poem, "Naturam non pati senium," (written when he was nineteen) Milton spoke of time as destroying the world and devouring its own father:

An et insatiabile Tempus
Esuriet Caelum, rapietque in viscera patrem?¹

It is a common enough approach to look at time as being a ravager, but it is unusual to present it as having a father, much less destroying him. A common explanation of this line is that Milton had confused two legends. It is believed that he had meant to speak of Chronos, the classical personification of time, but had really described Cronos, a monster seen in Hesiod as the son of Earth and Heaven and the devourer of his children.²

There are three faults, however, with this interpretation. First, it is presupposed that Milton, an ardent student of mythology, had mistaken Chronos (Time) for Cronos (Destroyer). Secondly, Cronos is said to have devoured his children, not his father. Thirdly, when speaking of time, Milton used the word *Tempus*, not *Chronos*; and there is thus no reason to mention the Cronos tale at all.

Perhaps the answer to this puzzling phrase lies in Milton's idea that "all things are not only from God, but of God."³ In other words he believed that God created everything from Himself. God thus must have created time; or, to state it another way, God was the father of time. If this were so, when Milton thus spoke of time as devouring its father, he would have been saying that time was devouring God.

This idea is not so strange as might first appear, however, as Milton

¹ "Naturam non pati senium," lines 14-15. All quotations from Milton are according to the Columbia edition, ed. Frank L. Patterson. Quotations of poetry are given by book and line, and those of prose by the volume and page of the Columbia edition.

² This explanation is given, for example, in *Paradise Regained, The Minor Poems, and Samson Agonistes*, ed. Merritt Y. Hughes (New York, 1937), p. 105. The idea is also examined in *The Latin Poems of John Milton*, ed. Walter MacKellar (Ithaca, 1930), p. 295. The earliest suggestion I could find of the thought occurs in *The Poems of John Milton*, ed. Thomas Keightley (London, 1859), II, 439. The passage in Hesiod is found in *Theogony*, lines 453-492.

³ *De Doctrina Christiana*, xv, 27. This treatise was written much later than "Naturam non pati senium," but the year of a work's composition does not necessarily date the ideas it contains.

believed that creation was *de Deo*, out of God. He therefore felt that God was immanent in the world, and that His spirit appeared in all matter.⁴ By devouring the world, time would then be consuming matter which contained the spirit of God.

Milton, however, wrote in his *De Doctrina Christiana* a thought which might seem at first to refute this idea of time having been created by God and thus not being a precondition of God's creative act: "there is no sufficient foundation for the common opinion that . . . time . . . could not . . . have existed before this world was made."⁵ In other words Milton was implying that time did exist before the creation of the world. As was seen, however, he also said that nothing could exist independent of God, that everything came from God.

The problem is easily solved when it is remembered that Milton did not believe that everything was created during the six days in which our world was formed. It is known, for example, that he felt that chaos, the primary matter from which God made the world, was created at some previous time;⁶ and he also wrote that the heavens and the angels existed before the creation of this world.⁷ Milton thus believed that "it was always in the power of God to produce any effect he pleased at whatever time and in whatever manner seemed good to him."⁸

The solution to the problem therefore lies in the fact that the forming of our world was not the only creative act of God. Time, among other things, had been created by a previous act of God; and God was indeed its parent.

In "*Naturam non pati senium*" Milton's thesis was that the world was ageless, and by utilizing a provocative image of time, he tried to show the folly of thinking that time could destroy matter in which resided the spirit of God. The question of Milton's accuracy does not

⁴ See especially *ibid.*, xv, 21-27.

⁵ *Ibid.*, xv, 35.

⁶ As opposed to the orthodox Christian doctrine of creation, Milton believed that the forming of the primary matter had occurred much earlier than that of the world and that it was no part of the creative act which made our universe. Arnold Williams ("*Renaissance Commentaries on 'Genesis' and Some Elements of the Theology of Paradise Lost*," *PMLA*, LVI (1941), 155) points out evidence from *Paradise Lost* that chaos was antecedent to all events in the poem.

⁷ *De Doctrina Christiana*, xv, 31-35. This is also seen in *Paradise Lost* as Satan and the rebellious angels fought the forces of God in heaven, and their fall was one of the causes of creation.

⁸ *De Doctrina Christiana*, xv, 31.

enter here. What is of prime importance, however, is that in this early schoolboy poem appeared the thought of time being a creation of God and existing before the world, an idea also seen in Milton's mature cosmology as reflected in *Paradise Lost* and *De Doctrina Christiana*.

Harvard University

EDMUND REISS

Symbol and Meaning in "The Little Black Boy"

At first glance, "The Little Black Boy" of William Blake looks easy in both idea and symbol. The idea of bodies as clouds obstructing the light from the soul appears in both Plato and Dante. The idea of equality before God is a commonplace from St. Paul onwards. The difficulty of bearing the light of God's countenance goes back to Genesis. The notion that dark skins are better able than light skins to bear the light of the literal sun is both popular and true.

And these are the major ideas of the poem. But put them together and they are not so easy. At a minimum, there is a vague impression of something illogical. Closer scrutiny discloses specific problems. The black boy is "as if bereav'd of light," yet his blackness better enables him to bear the light and heat of the sun, and hence better enables him to bear the light and heat of God as well. On the literal level, then, the blackness acts as a cloud against the literal sun; and it hence comes as a shock to encounter line 23: "When I from black and he from white cloud free." Now, of course, Blake is thinking of the soul's freedom from the cloud of the body. But the shift from one level of reference to another is not made explicit. It may be said to occur in lines 17-18: "For when our souls have learn'd the heat to bear, / the cloud will vanish"; but this is ambiguous. Is "cloud" here the black skin which protects from the sun but also makes for inequality; or is it the body (whether black or white) concealing the soul from the light of God? It is apparently both.

There is also the problem of the first-person pronoun. In "I am black," the reference is clearly to the boy's body. In "I'll shade him from the heat," it is clearly to his soul. In "we are put on earth"

his
ion
n's
ina
s
to
er
on
is.
er
er
al
d
k
g
m
d
it
t
r
e
n
n
"

it is primarily to souls, but since it is "we" on earth, the reference is to souls in bodies.¹

That is to say, Blake uses the "cloud" metaphor in two different ways (and sometimes both at once) and the first-person pronoun in two different ways (and sometimes both at once),² in constructing two parallel sets of relationships: the cloud (= black skin) protects "me" (the body) from the light and heat of the sun; and the cloud (= the body) protects "me" (the soul) from the light and heat of God. Or to put this in diagram form:

sun
clouds (= black skin)
body ("I")

God
clouds (= body)
soul ("I")

It is easy to see why this might cause some difficulty: *cloud* a double metaphor, and in the one relationship a metaphor for the object (body) which it metaphorically protects in the other relationship; *body* at different levels in the two sets of relationships; and the first-person pronoun referring to "body" in one set of relationships and not in the other! And there is the further complication that what *cloud* does refer to in the first set of relationships—that is, black skin—is very easy to confuse with *body* itself. Thus, for example, in "I am black" the *I* is the *body* of the first set of relationships, though strictly speaking it is not the body which is black but the skin; and on the other hand "these black bodies" (which are "but a cloud" that will "vanish" when we die) belong primarily in the second set of relationships, though the use of the word *black* (the inequality of the blackness will vanish too) involves the first set.

And finally, there is the complication of "as if bereav'd of light." At the literal level, the black boy is not bereaved of sunlight; he is better able to bear the sun's rays than the white boy is. But his blackness makes it *seem* as if he is bereaved of light (and there is also the idea of mourning in *bereaved*), as does the inequality which the blackness forces upon him. Even at the spiritual level, he is not bereaved of light to the extent that the white boy is; the sun is God's

¹ The *we* of the fourth and fifth stanzas is also ambiguous in another way: its immediate reference is "we blacks"; but it finally comes to mean "we human beings."

² As also the secondary metaphor of trees. *Grove* in l. 19 ("Come out from the grove") refers to bodies, and hence to shelter from God; *grove* in l. 16 ("like a shady grove") is a simile for *black* bodies, and hence shelter both from the sun and from God; and the tree under which mother and son sit in l. 5 is shelter from the sun only.

principal gift, and he is better able to understand it, and hence the God who made it; and there is also the implication that the innocence and adversity of his life better enable him to understand directly (and later on, to bear) the light of God itself. The black skin, paradoxically, is a source of knowledge, of suffering, and of protection.

Faced with so much complexity, one naturally seeks the reason behind it. And the reason, I think, is at least in part that the poem answers two interrelated questions: the specific question of why some people's skins are black, and the general question of why man has to sojourn on this earth; and the way in which these questions are answered is in turn intended as an illumination of the psychology of the black boy. But the two sets of relationships established—sun, cloud (skin), body and God, cloud (body), soul—do not operate in the same way with reference to the two questions; and this is why up to now I have had to speak in terms of relationships instead of in terms of idea and symbol or of symbol and thing symbolized or of image and reality. In terms of the first question, the literal set of relationships is the real and the spiritual set is the image, or symbol, illuminating it; and in terms of the second question, the spiritual set of relationships is the real, and the literal set is the image, or symbol, illuminating *it*. That is, the black skins are explained in terms of the God-soul relationship (the black boy's color on earth will fit him to help the white boy when they get to heaven—and their souls are the same color anyhow), and the God-soul relationship is explained in terms of the black skins (just as black skins, though basically undesirable, protect the unprepared from the sun, so bodies, though basically undesirable, protect the unprepared from God).

Thus a deceptively simple poem displays, as so often in Blake, an astonishing complexity. And of course the simplicity itself is a part of that complexity. The boy is unaware of the complications, and his very naivete is evidence demonstrating their truth. This concept is especially helpful in accounting for the problems of the final stanza, which are not explained by what I have said heretofore. For the equality in the last stanza is not complete. On the one hand, the black boy, even at the tent of God, and after all that he has said, wants to be *like* the white boy;³ on the other hand, he expects to

³ It is true that he says merely, "I'll . . . be like him," not that he wants to be. But like him in what respect? Like him in being a spirit? In one sense, of course, this is applicable, since the black boy has said that spirits are white, and hence, in becoming a spirit, the black boy has become like the

"shade" the white boy from the light of God. But the first of these anticipations weakens the argument at level one, and the second weakens the argument at level two! An equality "up" is no equality; and souls, free from the "clouds" of the body, cannot obscure the light. This is much too neat on Blake's part not to have been intentional: to the boy, his mother's arguments are merely a form of comfort, he does not examine them deeply, he makes them mean what he wants them to mean. He bears here, on an utterly unsophisticated level, a resemblance to those disciples who thought Jesus' message meant glory on earth, here and now. They, like the boy, were aware of no contradiction between the ideas and their desires. And there is a still further complication; for not only do the boy's desires in the last stanza contradict in a very human way all that has preceded, they are themselves mutually contradictory, displaying the boy's very natural desire to be both the equal of the white boy, and (in being better equipped for heaven) his superior. Thus the complexities of the poem are made dramatic by being put in the mouth of a child who does not understand them; and the boy's simplicity, which makes for the drama, is kept from bathos⁴ by his unawareness of the paradoxical nature of his desires. The complexity of the poem is necessary, so is the simplicity; they function together to make of the argument and the situation a unified, meaningful, dramatic whole.

University of Kentucky

JACOB H. ADLER

white. But they were alike in this respect before the "shading from the heat" occurred; and it is only then that the black boy says that he will "be like him." Does the black boy mean, then, that he will "be like him" in being able to bear the presence of God? True, they are in the end alike in that respect, but if this is the meaning, it is stated backwards, needing to be "And then . . . he'll be like me," instead of *vice versa*. The only reasonable explanation of the phrase seems to be that the likeness is anticipated as the fruit of a long-standing desire, and that hence the likeness is assumed, without reason, to be the result of a change in the black boy rather than in the white: a quite believable psychological reaction. If a more concrete connection is insisted upon between the event (I'll shade him from the heat") and the likeness, it could be the idea that to do someone a favor makes the favorer the equal of the favored; but even this is really more psychological than logical, and hence seems to represent more desire than mere statement.

⁴"The child's answer . . . would, in the hands of another poet, dissolve into bathos. Blake escapes because the atmosphere of innocence he has created is so completely successful."—Margaret Rudd, *Divided Image: A Study of William Blake and W. B. Yeats* (London, 1953), p. 81.

Wordsworth's *Prelude*: I, 1-269

It is my intention here to investigate lines 1-269 of Book I of *The Prelude* in order to demonstrate that these lines introduce and define the theme of the growth of the poetic Imagination, which as Professor R. D. Havens so rightly insists, is Wordsworth's principal theme in the poem.¹

The Prelude begins with a forty-five line lyric which celebrates the poet's release from the burden of city cares and his joyful return to Nature. The principal subject of the lyric is ostensibly the freedom and liberty of the poet in Nature, yet it is important to note that the liberty which Wordsworth celebrates here does not in itself account for the joy which the poet feels. He says:

Dear Liberty! Yet what would it avail
But for a gift which consecrates the joy?
For I, methought, while the sweet breath of heaven
Was blowing on my body, felt within
A correspondent breeze, that gently moved
With quickening virtue, but is now become
A tempest, a redundant energy,
Vexing its own creation. (I, 31-38)

It seems strange to me that no one has commented upon the possibility that, at this point in the poem, we have our first introduction to the theme of the poetic Imagination, seen here not only in terms of the inspiring and modifying functions it normally assumes in Wordsworth,² but also in its more normally Coleridgean functions of reconciling, fusing, and unifying. "The sweet breath of heaven," before called "half-conscious" (I, 3), here unites with a "correspondent breeze" within the poet, which inner breeze, stimulated into life, quickly becomes a tempest of creative energy. Yet, it must be noted, the outer, the "natural" breeze is not merely a kind of trigger which having activated the creative energy is lost and forgotten, but is itself an integral part of the creative process and so remains alive in the consciousness of the poet. The poet goes on to state his

¹ *The Mind of a Poet* (Baltimore, 1941), *passim*. The line numbers in the text of this paper are to the 1850 text of the poem as it appears in the edition of Ernest de Selincourt (Oxford, 1926).

² At least so runs the usual statement. See, for example, C. D. Thorpe, "The Imagination: Coleridge vs. Wordsworth," *Philological Quarterly*, xviii, 1 (January, 1939), 1-18, and Havens, *op. cit.*, chapter X.

Thanks to both,
 And their congenial powers, that, while they join
 In breaking up a long-continued frost,
 Bring with them vernal promises, the hope
 Of active days urged on by flying hours. . . . (I, 38-42)

The operative phrase is here "congenial powers," the linked and unified powers of "natural" and "interior" breezes, of inner and other weather, and what this phrase points toward, I think, is the real subject of this deceptively simple lyric and of the poem it introduces—the poetic Imagination and its relation to the "promises" and "hope" of the poet.

Such a conception of the Imagination as that presented here thus (1) defines an objective-subjective relationship between Nature and poet as being necessary to the initiation of the creative process, (2) holds to that relationship once it has been established as being the natural and necessary context for creation, and (3) claims for that relationship, or rather for the force that binds its parts together, the power to transform the old life into the new, to bring "matins and vespers of harmonious verse" (I, 45).

At this point, Wordsworth ends the lyric, the "glad preamble" (VII, 4), and takes up in narrative fashion and from a retrospective point of view an account of the composition of the lyric. It was composed, Wordsworth tells Coleridge, in celebration of Wordsworth's new-found freedom, but, more importantly, in a manner unlike Wordsworth's usual method of composition. To a poet "not used to make/ A present joy the matter of a song" (I, 46-47) these "numbers came/ Spontaneously" (I, 51-52). In short, the force of Nature's inspiration is here so great that what Wordsworth conceives to be the normal poetic process, involving the "recollection in tranquility" of some significant "spot of time" (XII, 208) with its attendant emotions and feelings, is compressed and condensed in the overwhelming and directly inspired joy and power of the moment. Noteworthy also is the fact that the composition of the lyric is described in images of fusion characteristic of the Imagination; it is "the mind's / Internal echo of the imperfect sound" of the poet's own voice (I, 55-56).

The poem goes on to describe the day of Wordsworth's release from the "vast city." Yet again the focal point of the story becomes an experience closely associated with the means by which poetry is composed. The poet, sitting beneath a tree and reflecting upon the "known Vale" he has decided to seek out, forms a visual image of a

certain cottage (I, 75-80). Although we have here no act of composition as such, there are indications of the presence of the Imagination, though at a considerably lower level of intensity, a "gentler happiness," than the poet had at first experienced. We note first that the visual image which Wordsworth forms is fairer than any "picture of mere memory" could provide and that in this mood, in tone remarkably like the "blessed mood" of "Tintern Abbey," a "higher power/ Than Fancy gave assurance of some work/ Of glory there forthwith to be begun,/ Perhaps too there performed."³ Thus the presence of this "higher power/ Than Fancy" here focuses, sharpens, and concentrates the poet's inner vision of his "hope" and "promises," providing him as it does with "assurance of some work/ Of glory."

At this point occurs a decisive event:

It was a splendid evening, and my soul
Once more made trial of her strength, nor lacked
Aeolian visitations; but the harp
Was soon defrauded, and the banded host
Of harmony dispersed in straggling sounds,
And lastly utter silence! (I, 94-99)

The poet's soul attempts to regain the higher intensity of vision which, we remember, it had willingly abandoned, "slackening [its] thoughts by choice" (I, 63) and fails. There are "Aeolian visitations," sporadic and fleeting, but the first requisite, the "harmony" which had existed for the poet by virtue of the presence of the Imagination in its most intense form has "dispersed in straggling sounds." And Wordsworth is wise enough not to attempt the composition of poetry at such a time. At the cottage, he says, he was content to enjoy only "the life in common things" (I, 108-9). He is content, having failed in his "trial of strength" to invoke the Imagination, to retreat into an ordinary, but none the less happy and cheerful form of existence. But this is, Wordsworth knows, not the best life and so he begins to hope:

. . . that with outward life
I might endue some airy phantasies
That had been floating loose about for years,
And to such beings temperately deal forth

³ The reference to a "higher power/Than Fancy" appears only in the 1850 text and could, I expect, be taken as an example of what de Selincourt calls "pietistic embroidery" (*op. cit.*, lix), but the phrase makes considerably more sense within the poem if taken as a reference to the Imagination, which is "higher . . . than Fancy" in the Romantic hierarchy.

The many feelings that oppressed my heart.
 That hope hath been discouraged; welcome light
 Dawns from the east, but dawns to disappear
 And mock me with a sky that ripens not
 Into a steady morning: if my mind,
 Remembering the bold promise of the past,
 Would gladly grapple with some noble theme,
 Vain is her wish; where'er she turns she finds
 Impediments from day to day renewed. (I, 119-131)

Taken in its totality, such a statement as that contained in lines 1-131, coming as it does at the beginning of a composition of the scope, nature, and announced intent of *The Prelude*, cannot be read simply as autobiography. We have begun with what Wordsworth has labelled spontaneous, unpremeditated poetry. The poet has then gone on to describe how he saw the first fine productive flash of insight and the poetic imagination fade quite literally into the "light of common day," not to be recalled or restored by conscious will and effort. It therefore seems to me that in having announced that "welcome light/ Dawns from the east, but dawns to disappear/ And mock me with a sky that ripens not/ Into a steady morning," in having stated that "vain is the [mind's] wish" to "grapple with some noble theme," in having, in short, moved from the joy of the "glad preamble" to the dejection and oppression of the heart which dominate these last lines, Wordsworth has within 131 lines defined, in terms of a dramatically conceived framework to the whole poem, the apostrophe to Coleridge, the theme of *The Prelude*—the discovery, loss, and hoped-for recovery of the Imagination. The poet has at this point reached that despair, that point of frustration at which the creative faculty refuses to react to any kind of stimulus, the point at which the poet is "neither sick nor well,/ Though no distress be near him but his own/ Unchangeable thoughts" (I, 137-39). This is the despair which is the polar opposite of the joy of creation which began the poem, and it is the recovery from this frustration and despair which to a large extent controls and shapes the action and the thematic movement of the rest of *The Prelude*.

Having thus announced his theme, Wordsworth goes on to re-define the problem in terms of his psychology of composition. In this section of *The Prelude* (I, 150-56), as in "Tintern Abbey," we may note the presence, though in variant terms, of the distinguishing elements of composition: (1) the "forms and images" (in "Tintern Abbey," the "beauteous forms") with which the process begins and in terms

of which it is externalized, (2) the "general Truths" (in "Tintern Abbey," the moral acts and ideas which become attached to the original image) which the process calls up, and (3) the "vital Soul" (in "Tintern Abbey" called the "purer mind"), the kind of innate mental and emotional equipment by means of which the "restoration" may properly take place. In short, in both descriptions, the initial "emotion recollected in tranquility" becomes a kind of matrix or center into which attendant and similar emotions and ideas may be gathered, fused, and re-created in poetic terms.

What then is lacking to the poet that he cannot create? I should say, although the word itself has not yet been used within the poem, the Imagination, here made to represent the focusing, directing power. Thus, while the poet finds "time, place, and manners" in "plenteous store" (I, 158-59), nevertheless the "ambitious Power of choice" (I, 166) runs riot and cannot settle on its proper object. The next sixty-odd lines show the mind of the poet, undirected, skimming history, philosophy, itself, searching out in vain some proper point of concentration. Thus, concludes Wordsworth, summing up his present, unhappy situation, his days "are past in contradiction" (I, 237-38), every "function" being locked up in "blank reserve" (I, 246). He has the poet's soul, his theme at hand, his image, his technique, everything, in short, except the "shaping spirit of the Imagination." And so, as before, Wordsworth must turn to the simpler, easier life, un-baffled and unplagued "by a mind that every hour/ Turns recreant to her task" (I, 257-58).

From this point it is but an easy step to the thought of infancy and thence to the "fair seed-time" and the beginning of the poem proper. The rest of *The Prelude*, developing out of the dramatic context established in these opening lines, is an active searching of the past in order that the poet may rediscover the Imagination which he found and lost at Racedown and which he laments in these lines. The poem as a whole, with its recurrent image of the "immortal spirit" which "grows like harmony in music" (I, 340-41) and "reconciles/ Discordant elements" (I, 343-44), shows clearly enough that the search was successful.

Mississippi Southern College

CHARLES MOORMAN

The Gnomonic Clue to James Joyce's *Dubliners*

In discussions of James Joyce's sequence of short stories entitled *Dubliners*, it is common to emphasize the last and longest of the fifteen stories, "The Dead," and particularly the final paragraph of that story as the coda to the volume.¹ Like a musical composition, the book introduces several interrelated themes or motifs, and carries them by repetition and variation to a magnificently somber finale. If Joyce thus consciously proceeded through fifteen "movements" to develop artistically the conception and perception of a tragically frustrated existence, then one must suppose that he lavished great care not only on the concluding, but also on the opening portion of *Dubliners*. Yet the first story, "The Sisters," has to date received relatively little attention.

Joyce himself stated that his purpose in *Dubliners* was "to write a chapter of the moral history of my country and I chose Dublin for the scene because the city seemed to me the centre of paralysis."² This pronouncement, with its reference to Dublin as the center of paralysis, has lent itself to extensive exploitation, for example in Jack Barry Ludwig's recent commentary.³ The key term, "paralysis," looms indeed large on the first page of *Dubliners*, in the opening paragraph of "The Sisters," and it has been pointed out that the boy-narrator's remark: "It filled me with fear, and yet I longed to be nearer to it and to look upon its deadly work," seems to apply to Joyce and his short-story collection as a whole. Certainly Joyce focused upon the term, which does not reappear in any of the subsequent stories, by observing: "Every night as I gazed up at the window I said softly to myself the word paralysis. It had always sounded strangely in my ears, like the word gnomon in the Euclid and the word simony in the Catechism."⁴ By these links he managed, of course, to suggest vividly the schoolboy world and the overawed and

¹ The indebtedness of that story and of its final paragraph to American literature has been demonstrated in the author's "Bret Harte as a Source for James Joyce's 'The Dead,'" *Philological Quarterly*, xxxiii, 4 (October, 1954), 442-444.

² Harry Levin, *James Joyce; a Critical Introduction* (Norfolk, Conn., New Directions Books, 1941), p. 30.

³ Jack Barry Ludwig, "James Joyce's *Dubliners*," in Jack Barry Ludwig & W. Richard Poirier, eds., *Stories: British and American* (Boston, etc., Houghton Mifflin, 1953), pp. 384-391.

⁴ James Joyce, *Dubliners* (New York, The Modern Library 124, 1926), p. 7. The passage, with its three interconnected terms, was not included in the first printed version of "The Sisters," namely in *The Irish Homestead*, x, 33 (August 13, 1904), 676-677.

benumbed consciousness of the first-person narrator, which had previously been hinted at by the parenthetical mention of "vacation time" in juxtaposition with "studied." But the term "paralysis" refers directly to the strange case of Father James Flynn, and both "paralytic" and "simoniac" are later used as labels identified with him, so that one suspects there is additional significance in the paralysis-gnomon-simony triad.

For better or for worse linguistically the most nimble of modern authors, Joyce seems to have supplied a clue to his intriguing concatenation of terms by stating that "the word paralysis . . . sounded [!] . . . like the word gnomon in the Euclid and the word simony in the Catechism." In his *Elements*, Book II, Definition 2, Euclid extended the use of the term "gnomon" to parallelograms, and Joyce was probably in the first instance led to the inclusion of the gnomon reference by the similarity in sound between the words "paralysis" and "parallelogram." A purposeful imaginative connection between the two words is established by way of their etymology and semantics, for "paralysis" means literally a loosening or weakening at the side (and hence the crippled and often helpless condition of having partially or totally lost the faculties of sensation and voluntary motion); parallelograms that are non-rectangular may be thought of as loosened at the side; and the Euclidean gnomon has moreover the appearance of an impaired, cutaway parallelogram—in geometry the term "gnomon" applies to that part of a parallelogram which remains after a similar parallelogram has been taken from one of its corners. One may well conclude that Joyce concerned himself in "The Sisters" with the problem of a gnomonic existence, insofar as he chose to present slanted and incomplete areas of human relationships, defective because of some weakness and loss. There is not merely the gnomon of Father Flynn's life and death, and of the boy's involvement with the priest; there is also the gnomon of the two spinster sisters, Eliza and Nannie, and their "poor James," and that of Uncle Jack and the aunt and the boy under their care. In this gnomonic frame of reference Uncle Jack's statement of principle: "Let him learn to box his corner," assumes an extraordinary significance.

The characteristics of the Euclidean gnomon are moreover exhibited by Joyce's method as well as by the essential human content of "The Sisters." Such structural detail as old Cotter's "unfinished sentences," the boy's inability to remember the end of his dream, his

groping his way towards his usual chair in the corner of the late Father Flynn's sitting-room, and the broken-off ending of the story emphasized by ellipsis points, exemplifies a condition even more strikingly indicated by the priest's talking to no one, wandering about by himself, and being found hidden away in his confession-box in the locked and dark chapel, and further by the symbolic gazing into the empty fireplace in the little dark room behind the shop. Even the empty and broken and then loosely retained and idle chalice may be termed a gnomonic device. (Incidentally, when Joyce followed the paralysis-gnomon-simony triad with the remark: "But now it sounded [!] to me like the name of some maleficent and sinful being," he may have had the word "demon" in mind, for Father Flynn's role is that of an evil tutelary spirit interfering, rather than mediating, between God and men.)

But it is not only in "The Sisters" that the lighted square of an upstairs window is studied in anticipation of its eclipse by the darkened blind of the dead-room.⁵ (Incidentally, Joyce adapts in "The Sisters," as elsewhere in *Dubliners*, also the sundial application of the gnomon, which normally serves to indicate the time of day by casting a shadow; Joyce appropriately inverts the process by having, at the end of his stories, a revealing, epiphanic light probe the darkness.) The failings and fallings of men, their dislocations, their incapacity to communicate and belong, make all of the painful cases included in *Dubliners* so many gnomons. I would cite as specific proof the recurrence of symptomatic images: the uninhabited house at the blind end, detached from its neighbors, in the back drawing-room of which a priest had died ("Araby"); the double isolation of remaining alone in a bare railway carriage ("Araby"); the existential problem of being separated from a familiar room, a motherless home ("Eveline"); little Chandler's inability to escape from his little house, a prisoner for life ("A Little Cloud"); and Mr. James Duffy's living in an old somber house as far as possible from the city, and in vain urged "to let his nature open to the full" ("A Painful Case"). In addition, Joyce deals with such gnomonic matters as the literally cabined folly of self-indulgence ("After the Race") and the dejected dreaming of some snug corner ("Two Gallants"). He refers early in the book to a "life of commonplace sacrifices closing in final craziness" ("Eveline"), proceeds via "the weakness of our poor fallen nature"

⁵ Compare *ibid.*, pp. 7 and 250, 278.

("Grace"), and ends with the oblique falling of snow upon a not-so-solid, dissolving and dwindling world ("The Dead"). The prominent linking of the Euclidean gnomon with "paralysis" at the beginning of *Dubliners* is then a source of revelation for the entire collection, and Joyce's stories—rather than being "tangential sketches," as Harry Levin has called them, or "houses" or "towers" built by the "block" technique, as Irene Hendry has asserted⁶—are, by the author's own hint, *gnomonic projections*.

Haverford College

GERHARD FRIEDRICH

The Fool in "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock"

Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren have explicated the *Prince Hamlet* passage in "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock" as follows: "Prufrock . . . knows that if he corresponds to any character in [*Hamlet*] it is the sententious, empty, old Polonius, the sycophantic Rosenkranz, or the silly, foppish Osric. Perhaps—though there is no fool in *Hamlet*—to the fool, that stock character of so many Elizabethan tragedies." (*Understanding Poetry*, Revised edition, Henry Holt and Company, 1950, p. 439.) In making their interpretation, Brooks and Warren—and many other explicators who hold the same view—seem to have overlooked one important point: There is no *live* fool in *Hamlet*; but there is Yorick, a *dead* fool, the sight of whose skull moves Hamlet to discourse bitterly to Horatio on the same subject which prompts Prufrock's ruminations—the futility of human existence.

That Yorick is the fool that Eliot had in mind when writing this passage may be supported both with reference to the *Prince Hamlet* passage if considered as an entity, and with reference to the Eliot poem as a whole.

To consider first the particular "Prufrock" passage: Every character (with the exception, some critics would say, of the Fool) is identifiable as an individual. Prince Hamlet is, of course, referred to by name; the attendant lord may be any of the courtiers, but as these

⁶ Levin, *James Joyce*, p. 32, and Irene Hendry, "Joyce's Epiphanies," in Seon Givens, ed., *James Joyce: Two Decades of Criticism* (New York, Vanguard Press, 1948), pp. 30-31.

are not individualized in *Hamlet*, any name—Rosenkranz, Osric—may be properly identified with the description; Polonius is recognizable as the sententious, almost ridiculous adviser. (It should be observed here that some critics have taken the Fool image to be a continuation of the Polonious image [e.g., Charles M. Coffin, *The Major Poets: English and American*, Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1954, p. 498n]; but the dash which separates the last line of the passage from the next-to-last, plus the fact that *Fool* is capitalized cannot be reconciled with this conclusion.) To pass, then, from the specific to the general, as Brooks and Warren would have us do in interpreting the last line of the passage, is illogical, if the unity of the passage may be perfectly preserved by casting "poor Yorick" in the role of the Fool.

When we consider this interpretation in terms of the poem as a whole, it seems even more plausible than when considered in terms of the single passage. Prufrock, fretful and futile, is aware of the meaninglessness of his world—the world in which he measures out his life with coffee spoons (l. 51); the world whose eyes fix him in a "formulated phrase" (l. 56) and whose voices comment on the thinness of his legs (l. 44). He mocks his world and himself as a part of it. But now it is too late for him to change either himself or his world; and he conceives of death as the eternal Footman, who, knowing this, holds his coat and snickers at his futility (l. 85).

Yorick had also mocked the meaninglessness of his world with its ladies whose paint was an inch thick; but "Where be your gibes now?" asks Hamlet. Yorick's gibes, for all their former ability to "set the whole table on a roar," have had no effect on his world or on Yorick either. If the skull could produce a gibe, the joke would serve only to mock its own grinning—to emphasize its own futility. Death has taken Yorick; he is "chop-fallen"—humiliated and dejected—just as Prufrock feels that he will be.

Wright Thomas and Stuart Gerry Brown have pointed out that the capitalization of the word *Fool* wants explaining. (*Reading Poems*, Oxford University Press, 1951, p. 699n.) Adherents of the theory that the word suggests a generalized fool may fall too easily into the argument that the capitalization helps to bridge the gap between the particular and the general. It seems equally logical, however, to assume that the capital letter is used primarily to emphasize the climax of the passage, and (taken in conjunction with the aforementioned dash), more subtly, to suggest a distinction between the

living characters to whom Prufrock likens himself (the attendant lord, Polonius) and the dead Fool. In this connection it should be noted that death in its representation as the "eternal Footman" is capitalized, and the *Footman* is the only other word in the poem so treated.

Another point suggests that the Fool, according to the present interpretation, is consistent with the pattern of Eliot's imagery: The *head* motif appears and reappears throughout the poem. The balding condition of Prufrock's head is mentioned four times: "With a bald spot in the middle of my hair" (l. 40); "How his hair is growing thin" (l. 41); "Shall I part my hair behind?" (l. 122); and "Though I have seen my head (grown slightly bald) brought in upon a platter / I am no prophet—" (ll. 82-83). (Like Yorick's skull, John the Baptist's head was separated from its body.) A Death's Head is completely bald; and Prufrock will one day be completely bald, or, if one takes his incipient baldness as a symbol—dead. He is not yet the Fool; but he is "almost . . . the Fool."

Southern Methodist University

MARGARET MORTON BLUM

Buddhistic Overtones in Eliot's *The Cocktail Party*

Buddhistic elements have been found in the poetry of T. S. Eliot, notably in Part Three of *The Wasteland*, "The Fire Sermon."¹ However, few students of Eliot seem aware that similar elements occur very prominently in his drama *The Cocktail Party*.

The key to the Buddhistic elements in this play is to be found in Act Two in the dialogues between Celia Copleston and Sir Henry Harcourt Reilly,² the psychiatrist who appears as "the stranger" in the first act, and between Edward and Lavinia and Sir Henry.³ Edward, Lavinia, and Celia discuss their particular problems with Sir Henry and they all receive essentially the same parting advice from him: "Go in peace. And *work out your salvation with dili-*

¹ T. S. Eliot, *The Complete Poems and Plays: 1909-1950* (New York, 1952), 42-46 and the note to line 308 on page 53.

² Eliot, 358-366.

³ Eliot, 346-357.

gence
advice
dying
War
ackno

Eli
of Ce
dilige
noble
when
is by
vocat
ness
havin
near
ultim
achie

Uni

Phi

Se
Imag
myth

* E
* H
is als
(New
* E
* C
* E
* E
* O
Johan
Karl
Bulle
* A
Penis
der R
(1904
136;
Jahrh

VOL.

gence."⁴ Certainly it is more than coincidental that Sir Henry's advice, given three times in the course of the play, is spoken in the dying words of Gotama, the Buddha, as translated by Henry Clarke Warren in his book *Buddhism in Translations*,⁵ a book which Eliot acknowledges familiarity with in his footnotes to *The Wasteland*.⁶

Eliot carries the Buddhistic ideal one step further in the character of Celia. Following Reilly's advice to "work out her salvation with diligence" she proceeds to do so by implicitly subscribing to the four noble truths of Buddhism: suffering is universal; its cause is desire; when desire ceases, suffering ends; the way to end desire and suffering is by following the eight-fold path which consists, in part, of right vocation.⁷ Celia eschews desire which has brought about her unhappiness and her "awareness of solitude."⁸ She goes off to Kinkanja, having found her right vocation in nursing natives. She is crucified near a hill of ants by the natives who have turned against her. Her ultimate satisfaction, again according to the Buddhistic rationale, is achieved in the attainment of Nirvana.

University of Pennsylvania

R. BAIRD SHUMAN

Philostratus' *Imagines* and Alciato's *Emblemata*

Several scholars have studied the important influence of the *Imagines* of Philostratus¹ on a number of Renaissance artists, mythographers, and authors of emblem books.² While this tendency

⁴ Eliot, 357, 366, 368. Italics added.

⁵ Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 3, 7th Issue (Cambridge, 1922), 109. This is also reproduced in full in *Sacred Writings*, The Harvard Classics, Vol. 45 (New York, 1910), 587-798.

⁶ Eliot, 53.

⁷ Celina LuZanne, *Heritage of Buddha* (New York, 1953), 290.

⁸ Eliot, 359.

¹ On the paintings of Philostratus, consult especially Paul Friedländer, *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentiarius* (Leipzig—Berlin, 1912), pp. 88 ff.; Karl Lehmann-Hartleben, "The *Imagines* of the Elder Philostratus," *The Art Bulletin*, xxiii (1941), 18-44.

² Achille Pellizzari, *I trattati attorno le arti figurative in Italia e nella Penisola iberica* (Napoli, 1915); Richard Foerster, "Philostrats Gemälde in der Renaissance," *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, xxv (1904), 15-48; Idem., *ibid.*, viii (1887), 29-56, 89-113, and xliii (1922), 126-136; Idem., *Archiv für Literaturgeschichte*, xiv (1886), 337-363 and *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, xxiv (1903), 167-184; Jean Seznec, *La survivance des dieux antiques*

or influence can hardly be denied, it should, however, also be pointed out that toward the end of the sixteenth century, the *Imagines*, especially in the translation and commentary by Blaise de Vigenère,¹ became a rather typical manual on mythology. Thus it is somewhat difficult to speak only of its influence on other works of the genre, for a closer examination reveals what is so typical of other Renaissance handbooks: in choosing authorities to corroborate their text, the mythographers cited from each other, often rather haphazardly. To illustrate this point, we shall merely mention Philostratus' chapter on Hercules and the Pygmies, a topic which is also to be found in Alciato's *Emblemata* (Emb. LVIII). The commentator, after citing Homer, Pliny, and Ammianus, states (ed. Paris, 1615), p. 485):

Cette mignarde fantaisie au reste depeinte icy par Philostrate, dont il croy qu'il ne se pourroit rien trouver de plus gentil ne plaisant à l'oeil, si elle estoit executée de quelque excellent pinceau, a esté touchée tres elegamment par Alciat en ses Emblemes:

Dum dormit, dulci recreat dum corpora somno etc.

The Johns Hopkins University

KARL LUDWIG SELIG

A Persian Source in Voltaire's *Lisbonne*

Voltaire, as is well known, was appalled by the havoc and loss of life caused by the earthquake at Lisbon on November 1, 1755. The first reports, exaggerated as always, set the figure at "100,000 âmes." Before the end of the year he had composed a poem on the subject, and called it "*Poème sur la destruction de Lisbonne*." The work was distinctly pessimistic in tone and left no doubt as to where the author stood with regard to Providence and the adequacy of eighteenth-century optimism to explain and account for the good and ill that befell Man. He hoped to jolt mankind into a re-evaluation of Man's predicament by pointing out that the widely accepted philosophy of the day was nothing more nor less than self-deception, something completely out of accord with the facts of life and experience. When,

(London, 1940), pp. 212, 221, 262; E. H. Gombrich, "Botticelli's Mythologies," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, VIII (1945), 29-30.

¹ Consult Denyse Métral, *Blaise de Vigenère, archéologue et critique d'art (1523-1596)* (Paris, 1939), especially pp. 188-210; Chandler B. Beall, *La Fortune de Tasse en France* (Eugene, 1942), pp. 28-29, 73.

however, he revealed the poem to friends in Germany (the court of Saxe-Gotha), in Geneva¹ and in Bern, he discovered, perhaps not greatly to his surprise, that if he were to have the audience and the influence he sought, the potion was much too strong. He would therefore have to attack the malady by prescribing milder medicine, a draught that the patients would not reject out of hand because the reaction was too violent.²

It was partly then to take away some of the bitterness of taste that the poet resigned himself to adding new verses to the poem in which he rendered his attack much milder and made the surprising claim that "je ne m'élève point contre la Providence." On more than one occasion over several months the poem was revised and new verses were added chiefly with a view to making his work more acceptable to the public he hoped to reach. Seeking an appropriate conclusion to the poem he added the following apologue:

Un calife autrefois, à son heure dernière,
Au Dieu qu'il adorait dit pour toute prière:
"Je t'apporte, O seul roi, seul être illimité,
Tout ce que tu n'as pas dans ton immensité,
Les défauts, les regrets, les maux, et l'ignorance."
Mais il pouvait encore ajouter l'espérance.

To undermine further the opposition to his point of view and to "fortifier les avenues par lesquelles l'ennemi pouvait pénétrer," he added a preface and more notes.

The suggestion for the apologue ending came from something which had impressed him presumably in his reading and the gist of which was jotted down in one of his notebooks. Houssaye and Moland give the poet's name as "Suzanne de Suze," whereas in the *Pensées, remarques et observations de Voltaire*, published in 1802 and based on a manuscript owned by Piccini, the reading is as follows:

Beaux vers de Suzene de Suze en mourant: "Grand dieu, je t'apporte quatre choses qui ne sont pas dans toi; le néant, la misère, les fautes, et le repentir."

"Suzanne de Suze" is none other than Suzani of Nasaf (or Samar-

¹ See letter of Dr. Tronchin to Rousseau (September 1756): "Lorsqu'il eut fait son Poème, je le conjurai de le brûler; nos amis communs se réunirent pour obtenir la même grâce; tout ce qu'on put gagner sur lui fut de l'adoucir; vous verrez la différence en comparant le second Poème au premier." in Rousseau: *Corresp. générale*, II, 327.

² See articles by George R. Havens: "Voltaire's Pessimistic Revision of the Conclusion of his *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne*," *MLN* (December 1929), and "The Conclusion of Voltaire's *Poème sur le Désastre de Lisbonne*," *MLN* (June 1941).

cand?) whose real name was Muhammad b. Ali.³ He was a Persian poet who was "chiefly famous for ribald and satirical verses." He lived in the twelfth century, a brilliant period in literature and science and one graced by Omar Khayyam. He is believed to have died about 1173. The verses cited by Voltaire brought him pardon for his riotous youth, according to legend. Voltaire's source assumed, apparently, that the poetic name "Suzani" was associated with the ancient Persian town of "Suze." What that source was I have not been able to determine, but D'Herbelot in his *Bibliothèque orientale*⁴ treats the poet at some length and says in part:

Souzeni, surnom d'un poète persien, nommé Schamsedin Mohammed, natif de la ville de Samarcande et qui tirait son origine de Selman Farsi, un des premiers compagnons . . . de Mahomet. . . . Ce poète est souvent appelé Hakim Souzeni. . . . L'on rapporte même qu'il apparut après sa mort à un de ses amis et qu'il lui dit que Dieu les [his sins] avait pardonnés en vue d'un Distique qu'il avait composé dans la plus grande ferveur de la dévotion. Il dit à Dieu dans ce Distique: *Je vous présente, Seigneur, quatre choses qui ne se trouvent point dans vos Thrésors, le Néant, l'Indigence, le Péché et le Regret.*

Browsing one day in his notebooks the French poet came across the lines and decided to bend them to his use as a conclusion for his poem. His reworking of the material does no dishonor to the original. One has the feeling that "ignorance" was added because the author, having decided that he had to yield, for the nonce, to the pressure put upon him to give "hope" a place in his poem, needed a rhyme-word for *espérance*. Professor Havens found a printed copy of the poem in the Leningrad collection which had an inked-in alteration of the last line, reading

Mais pouvait-il encore ajouter l'espérance?

It is evidence of the difficulty the French poet had in reconciling himself to the changes he had found it expedient to make in order to gain a sympathetic hearing from his eighteenth-century public. It is interesting to meditate on whether this later reading was perhaps destined for the Beaumarchais-Kehl text which the poet did not live to see completed.⁵

University of California,
Los Angeles, California

FRANCIS J. CROWLEY

³ Cf. E. G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia* (N. Y. 1906), p. 343.

⁴ III, 357. I have used the 1777 edition published at The Hague.

⁵ I have for some years been engaged on a critical edition of the poem which I hope to publish in the near future.

Sainte-Beuve on Chateaubriand's Eyes

Toward the end of the second volume of *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire sous l'Empire*, under the heading "Chateaubriana, notes diverses sur Chateaubriand," Sainte-Beuve included a number of observations on the color of Chateaubriand's eyes.¹ M. Jean Bonnerot has recently published² a brief exchange of correspondence between Sainte-Beuve and Barbey d'Aurevilly which illuminates the reference to "ces beaux yeux que nous lui avons connus à soixante, et qui avaient toujours été si noirs de mélancolie indifférente."

There remained, however, the question of the authorship of the lines beginning: "*Ottavio* avait les yeux noirs les plus beaux, les plus pleins d'ivresse qu'on puisse voir. . . ." Sainte-Beuve referred to the testimony only as that of "une personne que j'ai crue compétente sur cette nuance qui fait question."

Fortunately, the original of this portion of the manuscript has been preserved in the Spoelberch de Lovenjoul Collection of the Bibliothèque de l'Institut at Chantilly, dossier D. 583, folio 221. It is an autograph letter from Sainte-Beuve's correspondent and friend, Hortense Allart,³ who had been for a time the mistress of Chateaubriand. Between the lines of the manuscript, immediately above the first four proper names, are four notations in Sainte-Beuve's hand. These changes, made in view of the future publication of the letter, attenuate otherwise recognizable identities. The Lovenjoul manuscript thus reveals not only the identities of *Ottavio*, *Guglielmo*, *Henri*, and *Raoul* but also that of one of Sainte-Beuve's sources of information concerning Chateaubriand.

In the text which follows, we have italicized Sainte-Beuve's additions to the manuscript and placed them in square brackets.

¹ Sainte-Beuve, *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire sous l'Empire*, nouv. éd. annotée par Maurice Allem (Paris [1948]), II, 326-327. The paragraph begins: "Chateaubriand, brun de chevelure dans sa jeunesse, avait-il les yeux noirs ou les yeux bleus? . . ."

² Jean Bonnerot, "S-B et la critique de son temps. Barbey d'Aurevilly, A. de Pontmartin, Edouard Thierry. Correspondances inédites," *RHL*, LIV (1954), 456-457.

³ Hortense Allart, later Madame Hortense Allart de Méritens, was born in Milan on Sept. 7, 1801, and died in Montlhéry on Feb. 28, 1879. Her *affaire* with the author of *René* was recounted in the "Extrait de mémoires inédits" which form the closing pages of *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire* . . . , II, 359-369. Cf. also *Les Enchantements de Prudence* par Mme P. de Saman (Paris, 1873), and Léon Séché, *Muses romantiques: Hortense Allart de Méritens dans ses rapports avec Chateaubriand, Béranger, Lamennais, Sainte-Beuve, G. Sand, Mme d'Agoult* (Paris, 1908).

Jeudi soir.

Sampayo ⁴ [Ottavio] avait les yeux noirs, les plus beaux, les plus pleins d'ivresse qu'on puisse voir. Libri ⁵ [Guglielmo] seul avait un œil noir à lui comparer. Bulwer ⁶ [Henri] ⁷ a l'œil bleu clair de sa race normande, éraillé par la petite vérole dont il est marqué. Mon mari ⁸ [Raoul] ⁹ a l'œil bleu clair d'un chevalier français plein de fierté et d'arrogance, qui fait peur quand il est furieux. Ceci est pour vous dire que c'est la force et la jeunesse qui donnent l'éclair à l'œil. René avait je crois les yeux noirs, mais je n'ai pas vu cet œil furieux, je n'ai pas gardé ce regard dans ma mémoire, il le croyait très beau, il l'avait été sans doute mais l'éclair n'y était pas. D'ailleurs il ne regardait pas en face, je le lui reprochais parce qu'en fait d'amour il vivait dans les trahisons. Il faut voir l'homme de près et dans les crises pour se rappeler son œil.¹⁰ Jeune encore, vous ne m'avez guère alors montré le vôtre; il est bleu? L'Empereur, le grand, avait l'œil bleu qui devenait noir quand il était en colère. Mme Regnaud ¹¹ m'a conté cela, et elle le savait bien.

The University of Wisconsin

LORIN A. UFFENBECK

Der Schein von Heros Lampe

I.

Neben dem Element des Wassers erscheint das Licht als ein Zentral-symbol in Grillparzers *Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*. So weist Hugo von Hofmannsthal in seinem Aufsatz von 1902 ausdrücklich auf den Dichter, "wie er, der Trunkenheit des Todes nah sich fühlend, der Lampe nicht vergass, deren Licht die Wonne bescheint, und die vor dem Anhauch des Grauens verlischt."¹ In der Tat dient Heros

⁴ The Comte de Sampayo, father of Hortense Allart's son Marcus who was born in 1826.

⁵ Guglielmo Libri (1803-1869), the mathematician and bibliophile whom Hortense met in Italy in 1826.

⁶ Sir Henry Bulwer [William Henry Lytton Earle Bulwer, Baron Dalling and Bulwer] (1801-1872), English author and diplomat, brother of Edward Bulwer-Lytton. Hortense had been his mistress from 1830 to 1836.

⁷ Sainte-Beuve had first written *Maurice* which he then crossed out and replaced with *Henri*.

⁸ Hortense Allart was married to Napoléon-Louis-Frédéric-Corneille de Méritens de Malvézie on March 30, 1843.

⁹ In *Chateaubriand et son groupe littéraire . . .*, II, 326, this is extended to: "Raoul, mon seigneur et maître, a l'œil bleu clair. . ."

¹⁰ Sainte-Beuve employed only this much of the letter for his "Chateaubriana." The remaining three sentences were not published.

¹¹ The Comtesse Regnault de Saint-Jean-d'Angély.

¹ "Des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen," *Prosa II* (Frankfurt, 1951), 32.

Lampe dem Drama als Requisit des Schicksals. Sie zieht den Liebenden an und bereitet ihm seinen Untergang. Darüber hinaus ist sie das herkömmliche Sinnzeichen der Leidenschaft, die sich in ihrem Licht entfaltet und mit dessen Verlöschen erlischt.

Das Symbol der Lampe erfährt nun im vierten Aufzug von Grillparzers Trauerspiel eine Wandlung, die für die Beseelung kennzeichnend ist, vermöge deren der Dichter den Stoff eines Schicksalsdramas in ein Drama der Seelen verwandelt. Der von dem Tempelhüter alarmierte Priester zieht Hero zur Rechenschaft (er ist aufs äusserste argwöhnisch, doch noch nicht völlig bereit, sich seinem Verdacht bedingungslos zu überantworten):

Man sah

In deinem Turme Licht die ganze Nacht.

Tu das nicht mehr.

Hero: Wir haben Öl genug.

Priester: Doch siehst das Volk und deutest wie es mag.

Hero: Mags denn!

Priester: Auch riet ich dir den Schein zu meiden,
Den Schein sogar; viel mehr noch wahren Anlass.

Hero: Wir meiden ihn, doch meidet er auch uns?

(Vers 1430-1436)²

In einem subtilen Wortspiel wechselt der Priester von dem Licht der Lampe, die während der Nacht im Gemach der jungfräulichen Priesterin gebrannt hat, zu jenem Schein hinüber, den dieses Licht in den Augen eines Betrachters wie des Tempelhüters annehmen muss und der diese Jungfräulichkeit in Frage stellt. Ob wahr oder falsch, der Schein ist zu vermeiden, geschweige denn sein Anlass, der dann gar nichts anderes sein könnte als wahr. Grillparzers erste Handschrift ist noch deutlicher, wenn sie den Priester sagen lässt: ". . . Viel mehr noch wahren Anlass zu Verdacht."³ Die Assoziationskette läuft hier also von "Licht" (V. 1431) zu "siehst" (V. 1433), schwenkt in der gleichen Zeile zu "deutest" um, wodurch das Licht seine Objektivität verliert und sich in jenen Schein verwandelt, der in Vers 1434 noch halb das Licht der Lampe reflektiert, in der nächsten Zeile aber, da der Priester das Wort "Schein" wie drohend wiederholt, schon völlig die Bedeutung jenes Anscheins angenommen hat, mit dem in des Priesters Sinn der zu vermeidende Anlass so gut wie identisch ist.⁴

² Zitiert nach dem vierten Band der ersten Abteilung der historisch-kritischen Gesamtausgabe (Wien, 1925).

³ *Ibid.*, neunzehnter Band der ersten Abteilung, 371.

⁴ Dieser Assoziationsablauf wird noch unterstützt durch den Bedeutungswechsel, der sich im Worte "mag" vollzieht. Im Mund des Priesters ist dieses

Hero nimmt das Vortspiel denn auch sogleich auf: "Wir meiden ihn (den Anschein), doch meidet er (der Anschein= der Schein= das Licht= die Liebe) auch uns?" (V. 1436) Heros Antwort wird noch doppeldeutiger, wenn man bedenkt, dass in diesem Satz das persönliche Fürwort ("ihn," "er") nicht unbedingt auf den "Schein" des vorausgegangenen Satzes bezogen werden muss, sondern gerade so gut dem "Anlass" selbst gelten kann, der Heros Satze sprachlich sogar noch näher steht als der vor ihm erwähnte "Schein." Kein Zweifel, Hero spricht hier von ihrer Liebe, wenn sie vom Unvermeidlichen spricht, und der Priester versteht denn auch sogleich, was sie im Sinne hat. Mit ungewohnter Schärfe und beinahe im Ton eines Untersuchungsrichters fragt er zurück: "Sprichst aus Erfahrung du?" Darauf bleibt dem auf den Pfaden des Unbewussten ertappten Mädchen nichts anderes übrig, als schleunigst das Thema zu wechseln: "Was ist die Zeit?" (V. 1437)

Oberflächlich betrachtet, bewegt sich dieser Dialogfetzen in der Stimmung der Doppeldeutigkeit, die sich seit Heros Wortwechsel mit dem Tempelhüter zu Beginn dieses Aufzugs (V. 1271-1279) über die Szene gebreitet hat. Gerhart Baumann hat sich von diesem "bewussten, verhehlenden Aneinander-vorbeireden," diesem "fortgesetzten Ausweichen" an die Sprachkomik der "gespielten Stegreifunschuld" erinnern lassen, die Kleist im *Zerbrochenen Krug* hat Wort werden lassen.⁵ Freilich ist es wahrscheinlicher, dass Hero, die "Wienerin,"⁶ und der Priester, ihr Oheim, hier der Kunst des Wortspiels verpflichtet sind, die seit den Tagen Abraham a Sancta Claras der Umgangssprache der österreichischen Hauptstadt Reiz und Zweideutigkeit verliehen hat. Grillparzer, dessen Epigramme oft Musterbeispiele wienerischer Wortspielkunst darstellen, hat hier jedoch die Doppelbodigkeit der Sprache dazu verwendet, das Wort "Schein" zum Angelpunkt der menschlichen Entwicklung Heros wie des Priesters werden zu lassen. Lehnt im vierten Aufzug der Priester den Schein als gefährlich und verderblich ab, während Hero ihn als unvermeidbar gelten lässt, so sind im fünften Aufzug die Positionen der beiden Gestalten vertauscht. Jetzt, nach dem Tod Leanders und der Entdeckung seiner Leiche, ist es der Priester, der den Schein zu wahren wünscht:

"mag" mit "kann" oder "wie es ihm gefällt" identisch, während es in Heros "Mags denn" zu einem "Was gehts mich an?" hinüberspielt. (V. 1433, 1434).

⁵ Franz Grillparzer (Freiburg, 1954), 67.

⁶ Hugo von Hofmannsthal, "Grillparzers politisches Vermächtnis," *Prosa III* (Frankfurt, 1952), 259.

Ein Fremder ist der Mann, ein Unbekannter,
Den aus das Meer an diese Küste warf,
Und jene Priestrin sank bei seiner Leiche,
Weil es ein Mensch, und weil ein Menach erblich.

(V. 1910-1913)

Ihm aber antwortet die Liebende, indem sie auch den Schein jedes Anscheins weit von sich abweist und sich nun, da ihr Licht für immer erloschen ist, voll zu ihrer Liebe bekennt:

Verschweigen ich, mein Glück und mein Verderben,
Und frevelnd unter Frevlern mich ergehn?
Ausschreien will ichs durch die weite Welt,
Was ich erlitt, was ich besass, verloren,
Was mir geschehn, und wie sie mich betrübt.

(V. 1932-1936)

Dieser Durchbruch durch die Welt des Scheins ist der legitime Anspruch, den Hero auf den Adel tragischer Grösse erheben kann. Mit ihm ist das Licht ihrer Lampe als Irrlicht entlarvt und zu Schein, d. h. zu einer Illusion, geworden, die der kalten Wirklichkeit des Tageslichtes nicht mehr standzuhalten vermag. Diese seelische Entwicklung der Priesterin hat der Oheim, schauernd und bewundernd zugleich, schon früh (V. 1738) erkannt und als Reife bezeichnet. Es macht jedoch die Ironie aus, die Grillparzer über seinem Trauerspiel walten lässt, dass das als Schein erkannte Licht von Heros Lampe die Liebende zu nichts anderem hat reifen lassen als zu ihrem Tod.

II.

Der obige Hinweis möchte als Randglosse zu der Diskussion gelesen werden, die Emil Staiger und Martin Heidegger über das Wort "scheint" in Mörikes Gedicht "Auf eine Lampe" geführt haben. Dieses Gedicht ist 13 Jahre nach der Erstaufführung von Grillparzers Trauerspiel entstanden; eine direkte Beeinflussung ist aber weder wahrscheinlich, noch wäre sie, wenn nachweisbar, ergiebig. Denn es kommt hier weniger auf den Gegenstand, die griechische Lampe, an, die beiden Texten gemeinsam ist, als auf die Zweideutigkeit ihres Scheins, zu der jeder der beiden Dichter im Spätgefühl seines Daseins gefunden hat.

Staigers Briefwechsel mit Heidegger ist jetzt als Teil seines Buches *Die Kunst der Interpretation*¹ allgemein zugänglich (leider ohne die

¹ (Zürich, 1955).

bedeutende Auslassung Leo Spitzers zu diesem Thema!); das Für und Wider der gesamten Diskussion ist ausserdem von Ilse Appelbaum Graham so klar zusammengefasst worden,⁸ dass sich eine erneute Darstellung erübrigt. Graham hat aber das Streitgespräch über den "Schein" weiter entwickelt, indem sie es in das Strahlungsfeld der Schillerschen Ästhetik, vornehmlich der *Ästhetischen Briefe*, rückte. Dort hat dann Elizabeth M. Wilkinson das Thema aufgegriffen in einer Abhandlung, die Schillers Kunstlehre vom Schein an modernen Gedankengängen, besonders an Susanne K. Langers *Feeling and Form*, misst. Wilkinsons Schlussfolgerung orientiert sich an Goethe und ist gegen einen Existentialisten wie Max Bense gewendet. Sie lautet: . . . to "seem" is not to simulate a being which is ready-made and already in existence. It is a means of transforming mere existence into fully conscious being.⁹

Damit aber erweist sich die Tiefe des Verfalls, dem Schillers Begriff vom Schein in den nachklassischen Generationen unterlag. War Schillers Schein noch ein Mittel, um bewusstes Dasein zu gewinnen, dann ist er in Grillparzer zur Illusion geworden, die vom Bewusstsein zwar noch erkannt, nicht aber mehr überwunden werden kann. Dies wird vor Allem in den Schlussworten des Grillparzerschen Trauerspiels deutlich. Zum Standbild Amors gewandt, sagt die Dienerin Janthe:

Versprichst du viel, und hältst du also Wort?

In einem "Sein und Schein" betitelten Kapitel seiner Grillparzerstudie bemerkt Walter Naumann zu dieser Zeile:

Das ist die Sprache der Desillusion. Die Lieblichkeit der Liebe ist nur Schein. Sie führt zu nichts.¹⁰

Damit deckt Naumann unter dem romantisch-realistischen Rankenwerk des Trauerspiels den dunkeln Zug des poetischen Nihilismus auf, wie er schon früher von Werner Vordtriede vor Allem für den *Armen Spielmann* festgestellt worden ist.¹¹ Naumanns Deutung wäre lediglich hinzuzufügen, dass Janthes Zeile im Tonfall der Frage gehalten ist, so als hätte Grillparzers Kraft zum Pathos der Anklage oder der Wucht direkter Aussage nicht mehr ganz hingereicht.

⁸ "Zu Mörikes Gedicht 'Auf eine Lampe'," *Modern Language Notes*, LXVIII (1953), 5, 328-333.

⁹ "Schiller's Concept of *Schein* in the Light of Recent Aesthetics," *The German Quarterly*, XXVII (1955), 4, 227.

¹⁰ Grillparzer. *Das dichterische Werk* (Stuttgart, ohne Jahreszahl), 69.

¹¹ "Grillparzers Beitrag zum poetischen Nihilismus," *Trivium*, IX, 102-120.

Es bleibt aber schliesslich bemerkenswert, dass zwei einander so unverwandte Geister wie Grillparzer und Mörike dem gleichen Topos—einer antiken Lampe—Gebilde von ähnlicher Mehrdeutigkeit abgewonnen haben. Grillparzers Wortspiel mit dem Schein ist bereits ein so unabweisbares Symptom der Desillusionierung der klassischen Kunst- und Lebensauffassung, dass Staiger im Recht zu sein scheint, wenn er den Zeilen Mörikes die "persönliche Wehmut, . . . Scheu und Trauer" einer späten Subjektivität ablauscht. Andererseits lässt sich die Schönheit, die sich in Grillparzers Trauerspiel auftut, kaum besser bezeichnen als mit dem Wort von der "schon halb verschleierte Epiphanie,"¹² deren Abglanz Staiger in dem Mörikeschen Gedicht wahrnimmt.

Oberlin College

HEINZ POLITZER

REVIEWS

W. Schrickx, *Shakespeare's Early Contemporaries: The Background of the Harvey-Nashe Polemic and "Love's Labour's Lost"* (Antwerp: De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1956. viii + 291 pp.). TOUCHSTONE knowingly delineates for Jaques the varying degrees of Elizabethan effrontery, ranging from the mild Retort Courteous to the brazen Lie Direct. And certainly in the 1590's London enjoyed many literary duels where a thrusting Quip Modest was answered with a lunging Reply Churlish, and so on through the gamut of personal abuse. Dr. Schrickx has joined the latter-day spectators of these verbal combats and claims to have identified many of the masked adversaries by means of topical reference. He begins with the working hypothesis "that, for certain circles of readers, mythological symbolism and allusion were around 1592 charged with accretive meanings" (p. 209), largely because of the Harvey-Nashe quarrel. Committed to this premise, he then uncovers many possible Counterchecks Quarrelsome in the early plays of Shakespeare as well as in the works of Greene, Fraunce, Chapman, Bruno, and Florio.

Dr. Schrickx reconsiders Shakespeare's early theatrical activity, reviews the evidence for a School of Night, and offers learned notes

¹² Staiger, *loc. cit.*, 49.

on Chapman's imagery. Getting around to the matter in hand, he seeks to show that mythology was a common vehicle of personal allusion, and that in particular Ganymede was the sobriquet of Lord Strange and Cerberus of Nashe. He then turns his gaze on Gabriel Harvey, agreeing with the accepted identification of Harvey as the pedant of *Pedantius*, and proposing a similar identification for Torquato in Bruno's *Cena de le ceneri* and for Luxurio in *The Returne from Parnassus*. But it is difficult to go along with the conjectures of a man who can wrest from "quinsy" a reference both to Nashe as Cerberus and to the Harvey's rope-making father: "'Squinancie' is derived from medieval Latin *quinancia*, in its turn derived from Greek *κυνάγχη*, a compound in which the words 'dog' and 'throttle' are combined, and as such this fits in remarkably well with what we already know about Nashe and the Harveys" (p. 153)—i. e., that the Harveys wanted to choke Nashe-Cerberus with a rope.

The most useful portion of Dr. Schrickx' book is Chapter VII, in which he discusses the involved relationships of Munday, Nashe, Greene, Lyly, and the Harveys in the Marprelate squabble. He is helpful in clarifying party alignments, especially in documenting the conciliatory stand taken at the beginning by the Harveys.

The last two chapters deal largely with Shakespeare's early work. When Dr. Schrickx examines *As You Like It*, he claims to decipher many allusions to Harvey and Nashe, and therefore he argues that the play was written in 1593 at the peak of the Marprelate notoriety. In *Love's Labour's Lost*, Dr. Schrickx seeks to identify Ferdinand, King of Navarre, with Ferdinando Stanley, Lord Strange, on the basis of this evidence: (1) there was never an historical King of Navarre named "Ferdinand," and Shakespeare must have had some reason for so naming his character; (2) when the King and his fellows appear disguised as Muscovites, in the Q1 text Rosaline asks, "What would these strangers?" (V. ii. 174);¹ and (3) both Nashe and Chapman refer to Ferdinando Stanley as a man of intellectual habits, in keeping with the intellectual bent of Shakespeare's Ferdinand. Such an argument can be answered by only a very pale "perhaps." And in similar vein, Dr. Schrickx rummages for Harvey-Nashe allusions in *Love's Labour's Lost*, which he believes to have been written in 1592.

Without resorting to the Review Malicious, I can safely say that

¹ Q1, as the Variorum *L. L. L.* notes, "is unusually corrupt" (p. 323); and all other texts and editors have unhesitatingly printed *strangers* for *stranges*.

Dr. Schrickx is *à-touche-à-tout*. He touches upon everything, but concludes nothing. As a result, his book is fragmentary, digressive, labored, old-fashioned, and dissatisfying.

Duke University

S. K. HENINGER, JR.

Robert B. Heilman, *Magic in the Web: Action and Language in Othello* (Lexington: Univ. of Kentucky Press, 1956. 298 pp. \$5.00).

PROFESSOR Heilman has made a full and careful analysis of the language of *Othello*, and I cannot attempt in a review to take up the multitude of readings and comments his work presents. Many of them make their appeal in the mere presentation, others are controversial, and any student of the play may test their particular value as the occasion offers. I shall limit myself here to a consideration of Professor Heilman's method and his general conclusions.

In the introductory chapter, which is a justification of the method of criticism he is employing, Professor Heilman states that he will discuss *Othello* as "verbal drama" and as "actional drama." As it turns out, the study is preponderantly given to the interpretation of words and the systematization of images. Professor Heilman does give attention to action (his phrase, "actional drama," is always confusing), when he considers, for example, the way in which some of the characters act as if they were taking part in a trial before a judge. But even here the analysis of language is the main thing and very little attention is given to drama in its more usual senses. Professor Heilman indicates in his introduction (p. 5) that he may be thought to be treating the play more as poem than as drama, and he acknowledges that his analysis may lead him quite far from a consideration of the play as acted. The point he particularly wishes to make, however, is that, questions of drama aside, the interconnections of words and images reveal significant designs whose effects are of the first importance. The words of *Othello* when speaking of the handkerchief, "magic in the web," have given his book its title, and it is the poetic "texture" and the designs to be perceived in that that Professor Heilman considers to be the essential matter of the play.

In order to control the presentation of an all but exhaustive analysis Professor Heilman has chosen to concentrate at the beginning on Iago. After the introduction the first three chapters center on what the language and images tell us about Iago and his relationships with

the others. The next chapter presents a view of *Othello* that harmonizes with the designs hitherto brought to our attention, with particular regard to certain deficiencies in "the least heroic of Shakespeare's tragic heroes" (p. 166). The work concludes with two chapters that bring out significances prepared for by the previous analyses. These last chapters on "Thematic Form" are called "Versions of Love" and "Wit and Witchcraft." In the first of these Professor Heilman studies the various oppositions of love and hate in the play, and in the second he presents his conclusions on theme and structure.

"Wit and witchcraft: in this antithesis is the symbolic structure of *Othello*. By *witchcraft*, of course, Iago means conjuring and spells to compel desired actions and states of being. But as a whole the play dramatically develops another meaning of witchcraft which forces itself upon us: *witchcraft* is a metaphor for love. . . . Love is a magic bringer of harmony and may be the magic transformer of personality; its ultimate power is fittingly marked by a miraculous voice from beyond life. Such events lie outside the realm of "wit"—of the reasons, cunning, and wisdom on which Iago rests—and this wit must be hostile to them. Wit must always strive to conquer witchcraft, and there is an obvious sense in which it should conquer; but there is another sense in which, though it try, it should not and cannot succeed: that is what *Othello* is about." (p. 225)

More briefly, Professor Heilman says *Othello* may be called "the play of love" (p. 193)—the chief characters manifest the variety of the forms of love in their struggles and conflicts, and even Iago, "a hater, a strategist of love, and a philosopher of love . . . is also, in his way, a lover." (p. 200).

When the conflicts of the play are taken to form such a theme, it becomes easy to see how the play can be thought of as a "web," a "texture." The variety and contrast of various passionate attitudes, not events, are the subject. Professor Heilman's readings are often perceptive and sensitive but when we understand that this is their conclusion we also understand that this interpretation and his taking the play as poem more than as drama are parts of a single approach, a concentration on the psychological presentation of emotional states in the terms of poetic tension. Other readings of the play that have placed heaviest emphasis on the nature of truth or perfidy or honor or the evil of the unrestricted will were necessarily involved with the consideration of the play as tragedy, as the dramatic representation of persons and ideas in conflict, achieving in its resolution some great effect that satisfied the judgment. And indeed, action is the chief

thing because the work is first and last a play, even here where, as Granville-Barker observed, action takes place almost without reference to time. Professor Heilman is drawn to give the greater importance to language, and his psychological emphasis subordinates the drama because he has taken love in its variety rather some conflict of persons as the subject of the play. And the action that he does acknowledge, by the nature of the emphasis, give up a tragic for a sentimental interest, and moves with the language towards the exploitation of undefined feeling.

"In *Othello* Shakespeare dramatizes the extremes of hate and love. Without clichés or distortions he gives us devil and saint, for whom, in our more limited horizons, we no longer have an idiom but the sentimental one." (p. 214)

In this view the play becomes vaguer than tragedy, more diffuse, and less involved with the radical and final commitments of human character. And however complex the dramatization of "the extremes of hate and love," the play will be no more allegorical than it is tragic, for the issues are not to be understood in the terms of ideas or ethics.

If the result of this careful analysis of imagery and language is to the effect that the play presents no clear formulation of issues, this may be because the basis of the analysis is itself obscure. The following quotation by its indefiniteness helps explain why Professor Heilman thinks modern criticism must fall back upon sentiment:

"If we start by simply calling Iago a 'devil,' we risk using the myth of evil as a substitute for the analysis of the individual; his diabolical identity, if it is there, must be earned in the dramatic progression and discovered as a kind of substructure. What goes on in the play is less to be defined by than to define *devil*. In some characteristics Shakespeare's Iago anticipates Milton's Satan. But we come to the generic or archetypal only after we have gone as far as we can with the unique person; not that we come to it if it isn't there; but that, instead of initially dissolving the single human being in the mythic, we keep always a sharp sense of this single being and of the mythic, which we may think of as an auxiliary mode of conception forced upon us by the vast range of the individual." (p. 42)

The point here is an important one—how Iago can be both monstrous and a man. But the qualifications of this elaborate vocabulary signify an evasion of the values Shakespeare attaches to the idea of the monstrous and of the human, together with an apparently great uncertainty about the sense of it all. The analysis itself, in short, does not seem to be supported in a philosophical way, and therefore the

accumulation of readings can only lead to a most limited significance.

My conclusion is that this painstaking study is conducted according to a method that inevitably undervalues the importance of ideas, ethics and action in drama, and in the examination of *Othello* this leads to a false interpretation because the ideas of loyalty, honor, purity—and there are others—may be demonstrated to be determining factors in the actions of the characters and in the development of the plot. And when such is demonstrated, love and hate may be seen to be more profoundly conceived and to encompass more of the elements of the play than when the whole is taken to be included in the struggle of wit and witchcraft. And when these other matters are given their emphasis, we are able to see how the building up of suspense and horror and wonder are to help us understand the tragic quality of the action.

University of Michigan

JOHN ARTHOS

William W. Appleton, *Beaumont and Fletcher: A Critical Study* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1956. 131 pp. \$2.00). THIS is an admirably concise introduction to the vast dramatic output of the most successful playwrights of later Jacobean and Caroline times. With Shakespeare and Jonson, Fletcher "sway'd in the Triumvirate of Wit"; the three great dramatic folios of the age testify to the trio's unchallenged supremacy. The popularity of Beaumont and Fletcher continued into the Restoration, but after 1682 they entered upon a slow yet inexorable decline. In the present century, no longer performed upon the stage, they have emerged from the study of the critic and literary historian as inglorious leaders of the Decadence (a charge, incidentally, levelled against them as early as 1820 by Hazlitt). With Beaumont and Fletcher, according to this view, complex Jacobean character delineations gave way to stock *dramatis personae*; the splendor and energy of the earlier blank verse degenerated into rhetorical posturing and nerveless fluency; the traditional moral structure was superseded by unscrupulous moral juggling; tragedy dwindled into tragicomedy. Very recently, however, there has been a growing appreciation of the brilliance of their theatrical artifice, and an effort—particularly in the work of Mizener, Wallis, and Waith—to understand more fully the methods and techniques that contributed to their original triumph.

The present study, which is entirely critical, does not reveal Beaumont and Fletcher in a new light. The author's purpose is, rather, to synthesize, to provide an over-all view of their achievement. His work amounts, indeed, almost to a summation of previous criticism, which he has thoroughly absorbed. When he states that Fletcher "was denied the supreme gift—and the metabolism—of genius" but "had an extraordinary sufficiency of talent," he is making Coleridge's distinction. Although Mr. Appleton's attitude towards his material is sympathetic, he does not overlook the weaknesses—the "decadent" traits—which modern criticism has stressed, and he accepts the view that Beaumont and Fletcher were content merely to entertain a jaded coterie. Only once does he offer any defense of the content of their plays: "Their fondness for sensation and shock," he asserts, "their emphasis on sex, their energy, brilliance and wit, even their coarseness, all recommend them to the modern temper." One might argue that sensation, shock, and so on, are legitimate when serving some larger artistic purpose; but in Beaumont and Fletcher their basis is, to use Miss Bradbrook's words, "an outrageous stimulation," and it will scarcely do to commend them for their affinities to the most questionable elements in our own culture. When Mr. Appleton lauds the dramatists' stagecraft—their purely theatrical excellence—he is on safer ground. And this is the heart of his plea. "Their plays were written not to be placed between boards," he sums up,

but to be played upon them. . . . Though a surprising number of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays have genuine literary interest, still more might come to life upon the stage. It may be that our growing knowledge and use of the Elizabethan stage and Elizabethan staging will lead to a revival of interest in them. Let us hope so, for it is the spectator, above all, who can give us the truest evaluation of their achievement.

The faults of the book are miscellaneous rather than vital. Unfortunately there are too many misprints, which Mr. Appleton must wish he had caught, but they do not interfere with comprehension. Some confusion occurs on page 10:

Amintor's dilemma — will he avenge Evanthe's ruin or acknowledge the kingly divinity of her ravisher? — foreshadows the clash of absolutes and the moral crises that dominate heroic drama.

Evadne is meant rather than Evanthe (the heroine of *A Wife for a Month*), and she is not ravished. At times Mr. Appleton seems uncertain of his audience: he assumes familiarity with Calista or *The*

Careless Husband but finds it necessary to point out that "under . . . [James's] aegis that noble monument of English prose, the 1611 Bible, appeared." Attaching undue weight to Danby (*Poets on Fortune's Hill*), who is always ingenious but sometimes pushes an interpretation too far, he is led into declaring that in *Philaster* "we have returned to the Error's Wood of *The Faerie Queene* and *The Faithful Shepherdess*, but the symbolism in the tragi-comedy runs deeper and has more tragic implications." Conceivably *Philaster* "epitomizes the dilemma of the Cavalier age," but the distinction between symptom and the conscious use of symbol is worth preserving. The most regrettable omission in the book is the absence of any discussion of Beaumont and Fletcher's verse, which receives only passing notice.

The attractive features of this study, however, more than offset any incidental flaws. In little over a hundred pages, Mr. Appleton discusses, often in some detail, over fifty plays; he provides necessary background information about the age, theatrical conditions, etc.; he traces the dramatists' fortunes after the Restoration and, in a final chapter, surveys criticism through E. M. Waith's *Pattern of Tragi-comedy in Beaumont and Fletcher*, published in 1952. There follow a check list of plays, selected bibliography, and index, all of which are helpful. Although Mr. Appleton has assimilated the extensive literature on his subject, his book is not overburdened with documentation, and he writes with clarity, grace, and succinctness. If he does not delve too deeply as a critic, his evaluations are for the most part balanced and just. The author's interest in the arts will come as no surprise to readers of his previous book, *A Cycle of Cathay*; the present work is enriched by a number of apt references to architecture, music, and especially painting and sculpture. In brief, this is an excellent introduction to Beaumont and Fletcher. Treatments on a similar scale of other major Elizabethan and Jacobean playwrights are needed (Dekker, Middleton, and Chapman come immediately to mind). Let us hope that they will be forthcoming.

Northwestern University

SAMUEL SCHOENBAUM

G. E. Bentley, *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, Vols. III-IV (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1956. Vol. III: [xii] + 470 pp. Vol. IV: pp. [471] - 960. Vol. V: pp. [961] - 1456. \$23.55). BENTLEY'S *Jacobean and Caroline Stage* is one of those monumental compilations

which can justly be labelled Epoch Books: they are of incalculable value to scholars, for they tabulate, summarise and sift all previous work in the field. All future scholarly work on English Drama of the first half of the seventeenth century will belong to the post-Bentley Era.

The first two volumes of *Jacobean and Caroline Stage*, which appeared so long ago as 1941, dealt with the Dramatic Companies and Players; the new instalments—vols. III, IV and V—are concerned with Plays and Playwrights; a sixth volume is promised treating of Theatres and Theatrical Customs, and crowning the work with a comprehensive index. Until this volume is available, no final estimate of the whole can be made, for the ultimate value of such a vast collection of facts and authorities will depend quite considerably on an intelligent index. The lack of an index is already a handicap; for the scholarly reader will need this work for all kinds of information not readily to be located from the chapter headings. Thus, in his preface to vol. IV, Bentley notes that he has included plays performed at the Jesuit school at St. Omer; but the ignorant reader who wishes further information must plough through 1,172 pages before he is enlightened by an entry upon Simons, Joseph (born Emanuel Lobb). Chambers' *Elizabethan Stage* and his *William Shakespeare* were shorn of much of their usefulness by the imperfections of the original indexes.

Originally Bentley intended his *Jacobean and Caroline Stage* to be a worthy continuation of Chambers' *Elizabethan Stage*; and in general he follows Chambers' organisation. Since, however, the *Elizabethan Stage* was planned rather to be a preface for *William Shakespeare: a study of facts and problems*, Chambers ended his record at 1616—an unsatisfying date because it marked no kind of break or change in English dramatic activity; Shakespeare himself had retired from the stage for some years, and no one noted his death in letter or diary, or even with a bad funeral ode. The records in *Elizabethan Stage* were thus cut off in mid air, and the accounts of the plays of men who continued to write after 1616 were incomplete; and these writers include Jonson, Fletcher (whom Chambers listed under Beaumont), Dekker, Webster and Middleton. Bentley in *Jacobean and Caroline Stage* completes the notices of the plays of these dramatists, but for such plays as have already been discussed by Chambers he is content with a simple "see *Eliz Stage*." This method was, perhaps, inevitable but is regrettable, for as a result the notices of these greater playwrights are incomplete in both works. Moreover, between *Elizabethan Stage* and *Jacobean and Caroline Stage* there is an interval of a generation;

much of the important scholarly work which appeared between 1923 and 1950 is thus listed in neither volume. It would have been more logical for a work on the Jacobean Stage to begin with the accession of James I in 1603, even if some sections of information were partially repeated from *Elizabethan Stage*.

In listing the plays of various authors Chambers arranged them in a chronological order: Bentley prefers an alphabetical one on the ground that most scholars are more interested in individual plays than in the whole output. The arrangement certainly makes for easier reference, and doubtless those interested can easily rearrange the information for their own purposes. Bentley prints the name of the playwright in the running title: Chambers—as those who have used vol. III of the *Elizabethan Stage* know to their exasperation—did not.

Large compilations belong inevitably to the category of books to be tasted and read only in part, for they are themselves books about books read by deputy, and 'distilled books are like common distilled waters, flashy things.' Yet Bacon's general judgment is too harsh; for the judicious, who care to read *Jacobean and Caroline Stage* for its own sake, Bentley has many a private quip in the most unexpected places. The full value of *Jacobean and Caroline Stage* can only be tested with time and much handling; but certain immediate conclusions are obvious.

The first is that Bentley has won his place among the small band of great scholars in English drama.

The second, that Jacobean and Caroline drama cannot be properly appreciated and enjoyed until modern editions are made available. Bentley's lists show that the most recent complete edition of Broome is 1873, of Davenant 1872-4, of Fletcher 1905-12, of Ford 1893, of Thomas Haywood 1874, of Massinger 1871, of Middleton 1883-6, of Shirley 1833. New editions of some of these are reported to be "in progress"—in one case since 1939; but "work in progress" too often means no more than "claim staked—other scholars keep off."

The third conclusion is that a comprehensive literary account of Jacobean and Caroline drama is badly needed; for which the obvious author is Gerald Edes Bentley. Released from the restraints of scholarly inhibitions and free to indulge his own preferences and prejudices, Professor Bentley could write as good a book in the literary kind as *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage* is in the scholarly.

University of Michigan

G. B. HARRISON

Harris Francis Fletcher, *The Intellectual Development of John Milton, Vol. I: The Institution to 1625: From the Beginnings through Grammar School* (Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1956. [x] + 470 pp. \$7.50).

THIS extraordinary book, thirty years in gestation, invites comparison with Baldwin's volumes on Shakespeare, based on the same remarkable collection, at Illinois, of rare books on Renaissance education. It does not try to supersede Masson, who produced, we are assured, "the greatest single biography of Milton that ever was or can be written" (p. 2). It does try to supersede Clark's *Milton at St. Paul's School*, and to some extent succeeds. But such comparisons are misleading; this is a unique contribution to Milton scholarship, with the stamp of its author's personality on every page, including the iterative and somewhat esoteric title.

Professor Fletcher asserts (p. 327) that "the picture of Pepys in his own words makes the student of Milton grateful immediately that the poet remained serenely unaware of the need for depicting his lesser activities." If so, our gratitude should be particularly great as we consider the first fifteen years of Milton's life, for "there is literally nothing to which we can turn for any account of Milton as a boy," not even "a word of any consequence from Milton himself" (pp. 424-425); indeed, for the most part Milton "seemed definitely trying not to mention aspects of his childhood" (p. 390). Our fortunate ignorance does, however, raise the question of how grateful we should now be to Professor Fletcher for writing a 480-page book on what Milton probably or possibly learned in the period before he entered Cambridge. We are offered "not exactly another biography and not entirely an account of his formal education. It is rather an attempt to find the intellectual significance of the experiences through which Milton passed, the books he read, the documents he looked at, and the persons who instructed him" (p. vi). All this in the absence of biographical facts, but essayed chiefly by "working backward" from what the poet did and said in his maturity and by analyzing the educational materials and processes common in his youth. We are further told that this handsomely printed volume is the first of a series of studies of Milton's intellectual development "from the beginnings to blindness" or—with perhaps the promise of a surprise—"through about 1654."

Professor Fletcher's method may be fairly sampled from the 138 pages which he devotes to Milton's conjectured "mastery" of nine foreign languages before 1625. That the poet learned Latin and some Greek and Hebrew in this early period is certain, and Professor Fletcher,

by full analysis of contemporary texts and methods, helpfully reconstructs or suggests many details of Milton's basic linguistic education. He also avers, "It is certain that before 1625 a tutor was employed by the elder Milton for his son's study of the Romance languages" (p. 265), but the evidence proffered for this early "intensive" (p. 293) learning turns out to be more intuitive than logical. In short, we are asked to infer that because Milton later knew French, Italian, and what Professor Fletcher calls "Spanish-Portuguese," he must have begun the study of all these languages (plus Aramaic and Syriac, p. 283) before he was sixteen. "A basic bit of evidence for Milton's mastery of Spanish," we are told (p. 328), is his simple statement in a letter to Bradshaw (written 1653, not 1652) that Andrew Marvell knew Spanish. This kind of reasoning produces two interesting conclusions: first, that "the poet was not precocious" (pp. 74, 90); second, that "by the time he was ready for college he had become equipped linguistically to a degree that even in his own day was exceptional" (p. 430). It also brings some unexpected bonuses; for example, although "we have no Hebrew verse from Milton's pen," it is conjectured that "he wrote a lot of it" (p. 285), and Professor Fletcher therefore devotes ten pages to discussing how it was probably composed.

There are long, informative chapters on the boy Milton's possible or probable education in mathematics and in music ("we must assume that he had received a sound and extensive musical training in his early years," p. 338). There is even a chapter on his "Various Active Accomplishments and Play," in which it is argued that he had a "lively interest" in dancing and began in the late grammar school period "to secure the proficiency he claimed for himself" in handling a sword (pp. 386-387). Earlier chapters deal with the boy's physical environment (nearby Salters Hall, a collection of six almshouses, is strangely identified as the George Inn, p. 30) and with probabilities of his pre-grammar school education (the "Institution" of the book's subtitle).

Professor Fletcher introduces several persons new to Milton biography. Particularly appealing is the suggestion (p. 106) that a Mr. Shaw, curate of Allhallows, taught Milton his "petties." Although Shaw's name turns up in the parish register only from 18 November 1617 to 7 April 1618 (not "for a few years"), he is probably, as Fletcher might have informed us, the Henry Shaw who in 1616 took holy orders after graduation from Christ's College, Cambridge.

Hunting for a relative named Christopher, after whom the scrivener might have named his younger son, Professor Fletcher finds a Christopher Milton (1545-86) who possibly befriended the poet's father on his coming to London. Although he gives some details of this man's family (pp. 11-12), he establishes no relationship, and does not connect him with the Christopher Milton who married Katherine Wyndall at St. Michael's, Cornhill, on 24 January 1580. (Nor does he mention the possibility that the poet's brother might, instead, have been named after their nextdoor neighbor, Christopher Gould, instead of a Milton who had died nearly thirty years before.)

About ninety pages are devoted to people who certainly exerted a considerable influence on Milton in his formative years, but this material is disappointing both in its failures to add to existing knowledge and in its careless handling of many details. Professor Fletcher gives two photographic facsimiles of a signature of Milton's mother, Sara, without recognizing it (facing page 396). His chapter on the sister's marriage speculates fruitlessly on the choice of church for the ceremony and gives a confused account (pp. 394-396) of the marriage settlement (e. g., it not only "should have been" a tripartite instrument, it announces itself as such; Hodgkinson was not "soon to become a partner"; ten, not nine, pieces of property were involved; and the unexplained coupling of the scrivener with Milk Street is downright misleading). The somewhat fanciful material on Milton's father (e. g., he was "regular in church attendance," p. 49) also confuses known facts. The deduction that he "was born probably early in October, 1563" (p. 8), is based on faulty arithmetic, because if the birth month were October, he would have been a year younger than he said he was in the six depositions which Fletcher uses as evidence. (Moreover, Fletcher overlooks French's 1619 deposition, misdates the 1613 one, and undervalues at least eleven other depositions that suggest birth years ranging from 1564 to 1569.)

Thomas Young is promoted as Milton's teacher, not only of Latin, but also of Greek, Hebrew, and other subjects. This, I suppose, is almost inevitable since we do not yet know the names of any of the other "sundry masters and teachers" who, the poet said, were responsible for his education at home and, possibly, at schools besides St. Paul's. But even in other respects Professor Fletcher's account of Young hardly inspires confidence: he conjectures him at Cambridge in 1612, overlooks a second son listed by Venn, has him Master of Jesus in the period after he was deprived, and, although we have

known that he was "beneficed near Ware," states that "we have almost no hints that Young ever preached anywhere before 1620" (p. 150). The account of Alexander Gill Senior is much more helpful, especially in the analyses of his books (e.g., "the basic materials for dealing with Milton's own readings in rabbinical and cabalistical works" are traced to books cited by Gill, p. 283); but it must be noted that Gill was born in 1563/4, not 1564/5, and died in 1635, not "about 1648" (pp. 170-171).

Though some such errors are almost unavoidable in a work of such scope, Professor Fletcher's volume is marred by far too many, including one on the first page (Aubrey's notes on Milton were written in 1681-82, not "before 1680"). Sometimes it is simply Professor Fletcher's peculiar syntax and punctuation that create the error, as when we are told (p. 56) that "after the old rector, Thomas Edmonds, died 20 March 1611 n.s., Stock was appointed rector" (Edmonds, spelled Edmunds on pages 27-28, was buried 26 February; Stock succeeded him 20 March). We come to expect such sentences as this (p. 421): "the records of St. Paul's School that no doubt existed in perhaps complete order and extensiveness before the Great Fire are now known to have disappeared." Even when he resolutely sets out to "improve on the accuracy of previous accounts" of Diodati (p. 416), Professor Fletcher begins by having Charles's father born in "Geneva, Italy," and then awards him a non-existent "second degree in medicine." Whereas the *Oxford Dictionary of English Christian Names* calls Philadelphia "a favourite Puritan name," Fletcher finds it "unusual" and conjectures wildly on its source. Scolding French for careless handling of Charles's matriculation record at Oxford, he twice terms it, mistakenly, a record of Charles's admission to Trinity (pp. 418, 420).

Fortified by French's evidence that the Miltons had abandoned Bread Street for a suburban residence in Hammersmith 1632-35, Professor Fletcher insists (pp. 405-414) that this suburban residence was used as early as 1623 or 1624; but his argument ignores the fact, duly noted in an earlier chapter, that John and, later, Christopher were day students at St. Paul's 1620-30, reporting at seven in the morning and coming home for dinner each noon.

Although we are accustomed to assigning to the period before Cambridge only Milton's two Psalm paraphrases, Professor Fletcher would have us add non-existent "early forms" of the Greek Psalm paraphrase (pp. 258-260), the Horatian paraphrase (p. 238), the Greek "Philosophus ad Regem" (p. 262), "Apologus de Rustico & Hero"

(pp. 238-240), and "perhaps" Elegies I, IV, and V (p. 237). The "almost unbelievable perfection" of the Horatian paraphrase keeps him from pronouncing it the youthful exercise it would otherwise seem to be—even though the youth is Milton. (He scolds Hughes for "poetical insensitivity" in "maintaining that it was a school exercise," although as a matter of fact Hughes had dated it 1628-29, near the Nativity Ode.) A persuasive case for early composition of the "Apologus" is made; Fletcher found a similar Latin version of the fable in Mantuan's *Opera*, 1513. His case for the Greek Psalm paraphrase is, however, perversely farfetched; and, unaccountably, no evidence for the suggested new dating of the three Latin Elegies is ever offered, nor are these poems ever discussed as products of this period.

In making a mountain of a molehill, Professor Fletcher provides an abundance of botanical curiosities all the way up to the timber line, but his peak (sic) affords little in the way of new perspective on the boy Milton.

Indiana University

WILLIAM R. PARKER

George C. Branam, *Eighteenth-Century Adaptations of Shakespearean Tragedy* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1956. viii + 220 pp. \$3.25). THE author's stated intention in this study is "to examine the alterations to determine, if possible, what the adapters thought they were doing, to discover their motivations for sacrificing parts of Shakespeare that we particularly value." Result: a workmanlike restatement of what has been said since about 1912. One misses new insights, new quotations, and, most of all, any sense of the excitement of the 18th-century theatre, or of the dramatic impact of the plays, or of the personnel problems faced by the adapters such as Cibber and Garrick who were primarily men of the theatre. A main error of judgment is the author's tendency to lump the years 1700-1800 as a unit, to place a critical comment from the early years along side of a practice of the 1790's as though little if anything had happened in between. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 (on Rules, Languages, and Moral) suffer particularly from this. Chapter 5 (Stage Effectiveness) would seem to be the most illuminating. Several times in it the author comments that the acting must have done a great deal to enliven the "flat characters," but throughout he persists in treating drama as a text for classroom criticism. It can be brought to life if the

modern makes the effort to place it again in the theatre. To do this requires some knowledge of costume, and set, and mechanic device, of box receipts, of audience response, of frequency of run, of recorded conversations. No examination of text alone from the Olympian vantage point of the 20th century can ever throw much light on the motivations of the adapters of an earlier age. The book is readable, innocuous, and seems to be another doctoral thesis which has run rather quickly into print.

New York University

GEORGE W. STONE, JR.

William Clyde DeVane, *A Browning Handbook*, 2nd ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955. viii + 594 pp. \$6.00). IN the first edition of *A Browning Handbook*, published in 1935, Professor DeVane assembled and reviewed all the essential data available up to that time concerning each of the poems of Browning. The range of information, critical balance, and acumen of this book have made it an indispensable tool of modern Browning scholarship. Its reputation will now be enhanced by the recent printing of this considerably expanded second edition of the *Handbook*.

While Mr. DeVane has carefully worked over the text of the former edition, the most significant feature of the new volume is the review of the fresh and valuable material contributed to the study of Browning's life and poetry during the past twenty years.

Brief reference to a tithe of this may indicate its extent and importance. In the sphere of biography, several lives of the poet have been written between 1935 and 1955, the most outstanding of which is Betty Miller's challenging and provocative *Robert Browning: A Portrait*. A fruitage of Browning scholarship during this period has been the publication of a large number of the poet's hitherto uncollected letters. The most noteworthy of these are the correspondence of Robert Browning and Julia Wedgwood, edited by Richard Curle, and *New Letters of Robert Browning*, edited by Professors DeVane and Knickerbocker. In addition, much association material has been provided by the printing of the letters of Owen Meredith to the Brownings, the publication of the diary of Alfred Domett, and the re-editing with notes of Isa Blagden's letters to the poet.

Amongst many fine studies in the field of literary criticism, those

of H. B. Charlton, E. D. H. Johnson, and Lionel Stevenson may be cited as illuminating discussions of Browning's ideas.

In connection with individual poems, *The Ring and the Book* has been the theme of extensive comment. Outstanding articles are R. B. McElderry's "The Narrative Structure of Browning's *The Ring and the Book*," W. C. DeVane's "The Virgin and the Dragon," and Beatrice Corrigan's "New Documents on Browning's Roman Murder Case."

Amongst writings of general interest, the articles of M. B. Cramer on the poet's varying fame in England, and Louise Greer's book on his renown in America merit special mention.

Professor DeVane has evaluated this abundance of material with a judiciousness and intimacy of knowledge in accord with his reputation as America's foremost Browning scholar. An illustration of his insight and fair-mindedness is his comment on Mrs. Miller's biography, the first work to deal with Browning's life in its entirety from a twentieth century psychological point of view. He praises the freshness of approach of this able book, and its amount of new matter. Yet he is critical of its psycho-analytic bias and its misrepresentation of important poems. He pillories Betty Miller's review of *Andrea del Sarto* as "a perversion of interpretation."

Mr. DeVane writes with clarity and grace, and the organization of the copious detail of his book is excellent. His *Handbook* of 1955 is a fine contribution to Browning scholarship, and the standard authority in its field.

Bishop's University
Marshall, Texas

W. O. RAYMOND

Ellen Douglass Leyburn, *Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1956. vii + 142 pp. Yale Studies in English, 130. \$3.00). PROFESSOR Leyburn is willing to risk definition. In order to construct a rhetoric of satiric allegory—a form "more often written than written about"—she seeks its "essential nature." Her method is, first, to define both allegory and satire; then to compare: "the essential nature of satiric allegory springs from the characteristics which satire and allegory have in common"—characteristics such as indirectness, economy, didactic purpose, etc. Definition has a second important function; it is undertaken in the hope

that it "may provide some criteria by which to judge the works in question as works of art." After the rhetorical intricacies of Chapter One, Professor Leyburn moves into detailed and knowledgeable analysis of individual literary works. The range is wide: Allegories Controlled by Plot (*Absalom and Achitophel*, *A Tale of a Tub*, *The Battle of the Books*); Allegories of Mock Heroes (*MacFlecknoe*, *Hudibras*, *The Praise of Folly*); Animal Stories (the Uncle Remus stories, *Reynard the Fox*, Orwell's *Animal Farm*); Satiric Journeys (*Gulliver's Travels*, *Erewhon*); and, finally, Future Worlds (*News from Nowhere*, *Looking Backward*, *Brave New World*, *Nineteen Eighty-four*). What a grotesque image it is that shimmers back from such a mirror.

The author is at her best when she can show a close interplay between the satiric and allegorical elements of a given work, when she can demonstrate how the two modes (heretofore rarely considered compatible) become one in the fusion of realized art. The section on *Absalom and Achitophel* seems particularly successful in this respect. By any rational definition Dryden's poem is unmistakably allegory (Miss Leyburn defines allegory as "the particular method of saying one thing in terms of another in which the two levels of meaning are sustained and in which the two levels correspond in pattern of relationship among details"); and it is just as unmistakably satire (the definitive qualities of satire are "judgment and indirection"). She shows how the structure of the poem is governed by the given story, the "seeming story" of the Biblical narrative, and its relation—indirect but powerfully actual—to the historical events of 1681; how Dryden's method engages so fully both imagination and intellect that the reader participates creatively in the poem; how skillfully managed dramatic juxtapositions serve satiric ends. The poem and the method suit admirably.

But in other instances one comes to question this method of "essentialist" categorization, this seeking out of definitions to be used as normative statements by which the work of art may be judged. Is it really possible, one wonders, to define meaningfully (except by arbitrary stipulation) such complex modes as allegory and satire? Or if one does winnow out an "essence" from all the welter of conflicting usage, will it not be so general as to be of dubious value even in matters of categorization, to say nothing of its value as a norm? Professor Leyburn's definitions of satire and allegory are surely reasonable as far as they go, but when it comes to selecting instances of satirical allegory the marginal cases become troublesome. Consider *A Tale*

of a *Tub*. No one would be inclined to question that the work is satirical, and it is clear that the story of the three brothers is allegory, its system of correspondences between related event and implied significance worked out with shocking precision. But roughly two-thirds of the *Tale* consists of prolegomena and digression, of which only the Epistle to Prince Posterity seems obviously allegorical. To be sure, Swift's converting imagination found superb use for little allegories throughout the Digressions; and Professor Leyburn is unquestionably right when she says: "in the digressions as truly as in the Tale, Swift is saying one thing and intending something else. . . ." But she seems to me quite wrong when, in an attempt to demonstrate that the Digressions are allegory, she adds: "and certainly the pattern of relationship within the vehicle and the correspondence between vehicle and tenor are sustained." The difference in mode between the story of the brothers and the Digression on Madness, for example, is radical. Within obvious limits the significance of the allegorical sections can be exhaustively determined, the correspondences plotted. But it is precisely in the inexhaustible character of the Digression that its fascination lies. Its reading is open; that of the tale of Peter, Martin, and Jack is, relatively speaking, closed. If one accepts the Digressions of *A Tale of a Tub* as allegory, then the concept allegory has lost strictness to the degree that it can accommodate almost anything. "Allegory forsooth!" writes Tucker Brooke. "If the *Fairie Queene* is allegorical, so in their different ways are *Hamlet* and *Tom Jones* and the Book of Job; so is all great fiction and most great poetry."

Or again, consider *MacFlecknoe*. If allegory consists in saying one thing in terms of another, it is not clear in what sense (beyond the general sense implicit in Tucker Brooke's comment) *MacFlecknoe* is allegorical. Stupidity, dullness, "Pangs without birth, and fruitless Industry"—all these may be matters for praise in Flecknoe's world, but not in ours. Dryden's attack is conveyed directly, literally, by the language: Shadwell, trumpets Flecknoe, "stands confirm'd in full stupidity"; and we, the readers, feel an odd kind of joy: the fool speaks truth. Professor Leyburn writes of *MacFlecknoe*: "The doubleness of perception, the seeing through what Flecknoe says into what Dryden means . . . makes [the poem] give the authentic allegorical elation of seeing into a concealed meaning" (p. 34). But what Flecknoe says is what Dryden means; there is no seeing through that language, for it conveys the truth of the poem with a literalness which

is mediated only by the fine heroic tone of the verse. Here to be sure, is indirection; but it is not the indirection of allegory.

To offset what seem to me these inadequacies of method, Professor Leyburn has excellent things to say as she writes of *Hudibras* and *Brave New World*. In the chapter on Animal Stories her sensitive juxtaposing of Caxton's version of *Reynard the Fox* and *Uncle Remus* points up major qualities of both works and enables her to make earned generalizations about the literary use of animals as a satiric comment on man. The book demonstrates what is perhaps her aim over and above her desire to stake out a new genre: that allegory need not be dull and that satire, "like tragedy, is a way of taking seriously man's condition" (p. 137).

The Ohio State University

ROBERT C. ELLIOTT

Murray Krieger, *The New Apologists for Poetry* (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1956. xiv + 225 pp. \$4.00). IT is difficult to imagine a more formidable critical task than Murray Krieger sets for himself in *The New Apologists for Poetry*. It is a book in which the author is necessarily preoccupied with the nature of the artist, the work of art, and the aesthetic experience; with the roots of what John Crowe Ransom called "the new criticism" and its more important branches; with judgment, what is judged, and under what general principles the object of judgment is evaluated. These are, indeed, difficult issues. Nevertheless, in my opinion, the book's genuine problems are only hinted at by the author. As regards these genuine problems, the author suggests that the only techniques available for their solution—namely, the methods of philosophy, philosophy of art, or aesthetics—are precisely those he does not propose to use. It is not strange, therefore, that the reader is at once illuminated and interested and puzzled. *The New Apologists for Poetry* is, in fact, clear at one level and opaque at another. Moreover, the essay is as inconclusive on occasion as a book must be if its author is led to remark in its final sentences that "perhaps poetry after all asks not to be apologized for but only to be read. So if this bitter comfort is little assurance, fortunately there is and will be the thing itself—poetry—and the assurance of the rightness of his [the self-conscious theorist's] conviction that poetry bestows."

Mr. Krieger is at his best in the close examinations of the critical

accomplishments and shortcomings of I. A. Richards, T. S. Eliot, T. E. Hulme, John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, D. G. Jones, Robert Penn Warren, René Wellek, Cleanth Brooks, Max Eastman, Sigmund Freud, and Elder Olson. Here his analyses are acute, the evidences of his understanding and sensitivity to poetry amply evident, and his commendations and strictures well-taken and just. The new critics are viewed against the background of Mr. Krieger's belief that the problems of poetry are accessible to philosophical inquiry, that the questions are "worth asking and worth asking in this way," and that there is truth in the assertion by the new critics that the role of the artist in society is indispensable in a world in which science is damaging "culture by reducing the profoundest utterances of man's spirit to technological disciplines." It is his conviction that the new criticism "had to affirm the uniqueness and indispensability of art's role in society" and that its proponents "had somehow to assert at once the autonomy of art and its unique power to give meaning to our experience, a power allowed only by its autonomy."

I should remark at once, however, that the book is a "budget of paradoxes." By this, I do not mean that Mr. Krieger is not master of his subject, criticism. One does come away, for all the dilemmas encountered, with a clear and informed account of the accomplishments of Hulme, Eliot, and Richards. Difficulties do emerge, however, and they do so for two reasons. In the first place, the various paradoxes Mr. Krieger discovers for us are not related to the basic paradox which, along with some other disciplines, the new criticism seems destined to meet. Secondly, in my opinion, the book shows no evidence of Mr. Krieger's recognition that his basic problem does not belong wholly to criticism or to the apologies of the new critics. If I understand Mr. Krieger's analysis, he is reiterating at various stages of his argument the ancient quarrel between the proponents of two different theories or philosophies of art. For one theorist, art is expression or inspiration, for the other, art is making and produces an intelligible product by a demonstrable technique. The basic problem of *The New Apologists for Poetry* is not so much whether one or the other of the so-called new critics did or did not resolve his specific problem without being impaled on the horns of a dilemma but, rather, whether there is a solution to the questions, what is artistic creativity? and what is the uniqueness of the work of art? Some portion of the reader's puzzlement arises because neither of these issues is clearly presented in and for itself. The book is the more puzzling because in the process

of judging Ransom, Hulme, or Eliot, Mr. Krieger permits this underlying problem to remain implicit while at the same time he makes perfectly explicit the object of his judgment in the specific work of criticism.

That the paradoxes are, in fact, the ancient ones of classical philosophy of art and Crocean aesthetic of intuition-expression-imagination is evident in the polarities Mr. Krieger discovers in Hulme's criticism, influenced both by classicism and romanticism, and by both Coleridge and Bergson; and in Eliot's "utterly fused intellectual-emotional grasp which characterizes the poet of unified sensibility" and the traces of the expressionist theory. It is Eliot's "objective correlative" that comes in for considerable criticism, as well as the suggestion that for the poet "objectification is . . . no more than a mechanical transference." But this stimulus-response theory of aesthetic experience is as ancient as Platonic and Aristotelian theories of art as making, while the Coleridgean theory of imagination is that of the expressionist. One might similarly point out that the distinction between fancy and imagination is implicitly the distinction between reproductive and productive feeling. But it is more important to observe that Mr. Krieger himself wants to maintain what can only be a reconciliation of the theory of making and of expression in his desire to show that "the language is the idea—an objectified and communicable phenomenon, not merely a mental and purely private one."

In other words, we find Mr. Krieger encountering or producing paradoxes, while we are also aware that the specific instances he cites which appear in the writings of the new critics are but sub-species of the general paradox of art and expression, of fancy and imagination. In fact, I should hold that there is an even more inclusive paradox from which this large one is derived, a paradox which in its turn has its ground in theology. More specifically, what are here in opposition are analogies derived from quite different conceptions of God. The expressionist's theory derives from the conception of God as a Creator, that of the theorist of art from the conception of God as an artisan or Maker. I mention the latter problem, however, merely to indicate that Mr. Krieger's essential problems, the questions of artistic creativity and the uniqueness of the work of art, appear to me in some sense incomprehensible except in terms of the larger analogy. But even within the framework of Mr. Krieger's own analysis and without recourse to the background of several millenia of speculation, it is difficult to believe that one may expunge philosophy from one's tech-

nique and still be prepared to cope with issues which bear primarily upon our interpretations of human freedom. It is, of course, not wholly true that Mr. Krieger abandons philosophy. Eliseo Vivas survives where pragmatists, positivists, logical positivists, Platonists, Aristotelians, semanticists, and idealists die in their ranks.

Now, for the philosopher, the task of criticism does have a philosophical ground which he must make explicit. This fact may be attributed to bias but it is none the less a useful one once one encounters—as one almost inevitably does—the influence of such men as Plato, Aristotle, or Kant. I believe that Mr. Krieger encounters difficulties and puzzles his readers not only in consequence of the specific problems he raises but also because the philosophical nerve of his argument is never wholly exposed. In the first place, concerning specific issues, he is at times in error, at times dogmatic. He argues, by way of illustration, that the theory of the work of art as an organic unity is preferable to the work of art as a “mechanism.” It is difficult to believe, however, that the organic theory is less “mechanist” than any other theory of the structure of art dissociated from the end of art. Again, Mr. Krieger seems to accept the notion that a work of art can in fact be an identity of form and content such that no external relations are required to make it intelligible. Here his own argument fares no better than does A. C. Bradley’s in “Poetry for Poetry’s Sake” or Mendelssohn’s in the statement that, on hearing a song, “If you asked me what I thought on the occasion in question, I say the song itself precisely as it stands.” For once we grant that the work of art is related in any sense either to the artist or to the perceiver, not even Vivas’ phrase, “intransitive attention” will save this theory of the autonomy of the work of art. One might add, also, as a specific point, that it is at least doubtful that Schlegel was a greater influence on Coleridge than was Kant. Certainly there is no doubt whatever that Kant does use the imagination as a cognitive faculty in his first Critique and that one kind of imagination, the reproductive, is related to the theory of association of ideas.

These are but specific problems and relatively unimportant for study in literary criticism. The general problems which *The New Apologists for Poetry* raises are of utmost significance for the philosopher and, of course, for our concern with the critic. These problems concern the nature of human freedom. As I have suggested above, Mr. Krieger wants an answer to two questions, what is creativity? and what is the unique work of art? It seems clear to me that Mr. Krieger

fails to see that the paradoxes he discovers in Hulme and in Eliot are there because the western tradition of speculation answered its questions concerning human freedom in two quite different ways. One answer consisted in the assertion that freedom is wholly intelligible and explicable in terms of technique. The second answer is the assertion that freedom is genuine originality and, therefore, not susceptible to analysis or to reduction to techniques. The problem of originality is that of freedom, as is the problem of the unique work of art, and it is important to realize that such critics as Hulme and Eliot are attempting to reconcile the two theories—in fact, of art and of fine art—as, indeed, they should be reconciled. That they failed or that their views are paradoxical simply indicates the difficulty of one of philosophy's central problems. It was the same issue of human freedom in art which led to the most significant critical and philosophical conflicts of the 18th century concerning the genius, presumably one who was wholly original, and the product of beautiful art, which was presumably wholly novel and unique. It was fortunate for that century that there was a Kant to assert that the genius is not wholly creative but must practice an art and that the product of "beautiful art" is not wholly unique. But what Kant saw most clearly was that what the great artist does create is not a novel or unique work of art but, rather, another creator in another genius. Complete creativity or originality is without law or guidance. Uniqueness is unintelligible, except in the sense that an individual work of art may be made by an artist whose work is characterized by what he, the artist, is. But even this is not enough. The individual work of art is an individual of an aesthetic class and this it can be only after it has been made as a specification of a genus.

It would be wholly unfair to Mr. Krieger to suggest that *The New Apologists for Poetry* would have been a better book had it been written without reference to philosophy. Without philosophy, there would probably have been no book. But it is not unfair, perhaps, to suggest that one may be as dogmatic about one's attitude towards philosophy as one may be about other matters of importance and that perhaps more tolerance would have permitted this book to avoid some of the fallacies of "misplaced concreteness." Not all philosophers are philosophers of language nor are they logicians. I doubt that there are many, however, who possess Mr. Krieger's genuine love for poetry and his extraordinary capacity for analysis at the critical level. For Mr. Krieger does apply his principles to works of art and to criticism. One

may prefer an alternative method by which science and art are shown to be interrelated or one may prefer an analysis of the "new" such as appears in Focillon's *The Life of Forms*. But Mr. Krieger has written an excellent book and it is probably only the philosopher who will ask whether the principles he applies are critical or philosophical.

Bryn Mawr College

MILTON C. NAHM

George Cary, *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. D. J. A. Ross (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1956. xvi + 415 pp. \$9.50). THE medieval Alexander studied by the late George Cary is the Western-European Alexander found in the literatures of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain. The book started as a dissertation at Cambridge University. After Cary's premature death, three years later, Dr. David Ross, of the University of London, accepted to see it through publication. He has made several additions, among them a very serviceable account of recent research on the Greek Alexander Romance (Pseudo-Callisthenes) and valuable comments on the iconography of the Alexander legend. In Part A (pp. 9-74) are listed and described the various works, biblical, historical, pseudo-historical, or of a moralizing nature, from which medieval writers drew their knowledge of Alexander the Great. Part B (pp. 75-274) is devoted to an appraisal of the diverse figures which the imagination of the Middle Ages conjured up under the name of Alexander. There follow copious notes (pp. 275-351) to Part B, three appendices, a bibliography,¹ and an index.

Cary's survey of Alexander sources is heavily indebted to Professor Magoun's Introduction to his edition of the fragmentary Middle-English alliterative Alexander (*The Gestes of King Alexander of Macedon*, Cambridge, Mass., 1929). In fact it might be said to repre-

¹ To Cary's bibliography the following items might be added: Armand Abel, *Le Roman d'Alexandre, légendaire médiéval*, Bruxelles, 1955; Frederick B. Agard, "Anglo-Norman Versification and the *Roman de Toute Chevalerie*," *RR* 33 (1942), 216-235; Julio Berzunza, *Alexander the Great and the Alexander Romances*, privately printed, 1939; Clovis Brunel, "Une traduction provençale des *Dits des Philosophes* de Guillaume de Tignonville," *BEC* 100 (1939), 309-328; R. M. Dawkins, "Alexander and the Water of Life," *MedA* 6 (1937), 173-192; Edmond Faral, "Le Dit d'Aristote," *Neo* 31 (1947), 100-103; E. B. Ham, *Textual Criticism and Jehan le Venelais*, MPLL 22, Ann Arbor, 1946; Mary Lascelles, "Alexander and the Earthly Paradise in Mediaeval English Writings," *MedA* 5 (1936), 31-47, 79-104, 173-188; Joachim Storost, "Femme chevalchat Aristotte," *ZFSL* 66 (1956), 186-201; Antoine Thomas, "Un manuscrit inédit du *Liber Monstrorum* (Bibl. de Leide, Voss. lat. oct. 60)," *Bulletin Du Cange*, 1 (1924), 232-245.

sent a revised and enlarged version of the Magoun Introduction, except that material dealing with East-European and Eastern texts has been compressed. Since Magoun's *Gests* has been a vade-mecum for Alexander scholars for many years, the usefulness of Cary's pages 9-74 becomes readily apparent. I have very few comments to offer in the way of additions or corrections to Part A. On pages 14-16 it is erroneously stated that Fr. Pfister's *Kleine Texte zum Alexanderroman* contain *Epistola I* followed by *Epistola II*, the truth being that *Kleine Texte*, pp. 21-37, reproduce the text of *Epistola II*, whereas pp. 38-41 present us with a third version of the *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*, which might be termed *Epistola III* in order to avoid future confusion. On page 35 it is implied that Thomas of Kent, the author of the *Roman de toute chevalerie*, borrowed an episode from the *Iter ad Paradisum*, but the episode is an interpolation found only in the Durham manuscript (see Johanna Weynand, *Der Roman de toute Chevalerie in seinem Verhältnis zu seinen Quellen*, pp. 71-73). On page 62 a fourth manuscript, Paris, Bibl. Nat., f. lat. 14629, should have been mentioned as representing the interpolated Quintus Curtius. Also a section on Juvenal, or at least a reference to lines 168-173 of Satire X, would not have been amiss.

Cary's approach to Part B can best be summarized in his own words: "After this preliminary examination of the textual tradition my aim in the rest of the book is to establish the general underlying conceptions of Alexander the Great that were current in the Middle Ages, to discuss their formation and the effect upon them of the various influences to which they were subject, and to show how they reflect the social history of the period" (p. 2). Four categories of writers are distinguished, the philosophers or moralists, the theologians and mystics, the preachers and compilers of *exempla*, and the secular writers, whose main purpose was to entertain. The moralists tended to tone down the unfavorable material gathered in Cicero and Seneca, the theologians held a contrary view and were at pains to explain away anything favorable to Alexander (e. g. Josephus' story that God appeared to the King in a dream), the writers of *exempla* sided with the moralists (but the preachers with the theologians), while the authors of romances and tales of entertainment alone were outright in their praise. Time and place gave rise to complications. Thus Germany is generally hostile to Alexander, and the later Middle Ages are more preoccupied with the historical aspects of the Conqueror's life.

The material assembled by Cary is extensive, intricate, difficult to

organize into a meaningful pattern. On the whole, he has handled his task with signal success. His analyses are lucid and methodical, his judgment excellent. He has covered a wider area than Paul Meyer (France), Elisabeth Grammel (Germany), or Joachim Storost (Italy), and he dominates the scene in a manner which their more limited studies could not hope to achieve. Because Cary has had so much material to examine, it is hardly surprising that occasionally he fails to mention a pertinent text or does not give sufficient attention to a particular passage. On pages 209-218 and 359-368, he discusses Alexander's proverbial reputation for liberality, yet he does not adduce in this connection I Maccabees 1, 7 (*Et vocavit pueros suos nobiles, qui secum erant nutriti a juventute, et divisit illis regnum suum cum adhuc viveret*). On page 174, commenting on lines 269-308 of the third Branch of the *Roman d'Alexandre*, he writes: "Darius' dying speech no longer contains admonitions against pride; it conveys only the request to marry Roxana and to avenge his murder." Cary has overlooked the fact that in this same speech Darius warns Alexander against putting his trust in low-born counsellors and ascribes his own downfall to their misrule and tyranny.²

This is an exceedingly good book. Soundly documented, it is very valuable for its references; it offers interesting insights into medieval culture, it is well written, very readable, with attractive illustrations, and beautifully printed. It should tempt any medieval scholar, and the classicists, perhaps, will find it not unworthy of serving as a companion volume to W. W. Tarn's *Alexander the Great*.

Princeton University

ALFRED FOULET

Margaret M. Pelan, ed., *Floire et Blancheflor, nouvelle édition revue, corrigée et augmentée* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. xxx + 197 pp. Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 7).

THE simple tale of Floire, the son of the sultan Fenix, and the Christian maiden named Blancheflor enjoyed widespread popularity in the Middle Ages. The boy and girl, fourteen years old, are true lovers. Fenix becomes infuriated; he sends Floire to Montoire, and he sells Blancheflor as a slave. When the boy returns, he must sally forth in

² It is entirely possible that the Old-French poet (Lambert le Tort) who wrote lines 269-308 was inspired by Ecclesiasticus X 8: *Regnum a gente in gentem transfertur propter injustitias, et injurias, et contumelias, et diversos dolos*.

quest of his beloved. After many adventures, he reaches Babylon, where Blancheflor is kept in custody with 140 other girls. The two lovers are condemned to death by fire, but then the sultan relents, and the wedding is celebrated. When Floire inherits the empire, he becomes a Christian and forces his followers to be converted.

Both of the twelfth-century versions were transposed into other languages: the first into German, Dutch, English, Norwegian, and Swedish; the other into Italian, Spanish, and Mediaeval Greek. The "aristocratic" version survives in four Old French manuscripts: A (ca. 3200 lines; end of 13th century); B (ca. 3000 lines; first half of 14th); C (ca. 3200 lines; beginning of 15th); V (ca. 1000 lines; beginning of 13th). The 3500 lines of the "popular" version are preserved only in D, which belongs to the 13th century. As early as 1844 and 1856, A was edited by I. Bekker (inadequately) and by E. Du Méril. Two decades ago, three women decided independently to reëdit the poem: Miss Wirtz used A (defectively); Miss Krüger chose A and added D; Miss Pelan preferred B. The paleographic material now available reflects different French dialects and offers a tremendous multiplicity of variants. The appeal, made by Gamillscheg in 1939, for a composite reconstruction of the original text should remain unanswered.

The new edition has an appropriate introduction. It presents a meritorious revision of the 1937 text with the critical apparatus taken from A, C, and V. The fragment V is no longer separated but is inserted conveniently in the variants. It was inadvisable, however, to wedge 200 verses of A and C into pages 102-5 instead of printing them separately as an intercalation in the text. The glossary is improved, and the notes are extended from seven to thirty-one pages; still, a few details call for special comment.

Apparently Dr. Pelan intended to have her remark in the first paragraph—"Les quatre premiers se trouvent à la Bibliothèque Nationale"—cover manuscripts A, B, C, skip V, and include D. The proverb *mere que mere* (p. 153) is analyzed in *MLQ*, xvii (1956), 17-20. The spelling *s'enechier* (p. 165) was corrected as *senechier* in *Rom. Rev.*, xxxv (1944), 324. Miss Pelan equates *fetis* (p. 183) with *fetiz* "artificiel," which semantically reproduces the Latin etymon. As was noted by Scheler, *Les Enfances Ogier*, p. 286, the original meaning of *facticius* evolved into "fait avec art, fait selon les règles, convenable, parfait." It is obvious that *fetis*, applied to birds in line 1760, means "bien fait, joli" just as it does when a falcon and a nightingale are being described in the *Roman du Castelain de Coucy*.

2026 and *Recueil général des jeux-partis*, No. 127. The infinitive *quedre* (p. 189) is deduced from the forms *queudra* and *quelt*, probably because Tobler-Lommatzsch record *cuiedre*, but it seems preferable to follow Godefroy for the orthography *quelir* "cueillir."

Miss Pelan treats *s'en consiurrera* (p. 155) as a "négligence de copiste." The emendation, *s'en consevrera*, is posited upon the hapax *se consevrer* "se séparer" used by Thomas de Kent. The reading *s'en consierra* in A has been justified etymologically by Du Ménil, p. 254, and *s'en puet consirrer* in D is quoted by Godefroy, II, p. 256a. The meaning "se passer de, se priver de" applies aptly to this line 919 as well as to *se consiurrer* in *L'Escoufle* 5188, in *Escanor* 21708, and in the *Chansons satiriques et bachiques*, No. 31. Incidentally there was no need to mention the very common verb *consivre* "suivre, atteindre," unless it is supposed to account for the variant in V.

The 1956 edition opens with an expression of gratitude to Ivor Arnold and Ernest Hoepffner. The recent departure of these outstanding philologists is mourned universally.

University of Texas

RAPHAEL LEVY

Chrétien de Troyes, *Le Roman de Perceval, ou Le Conte du Graal*, publié d'après le manuscrit français de la Bibliothèque Nationale, ed. William Roach (Geneva: Droz, and Lille: Giard, 1956. xiv + 315 pp. Textes Littéraires Français). SINCE the publication of Alfons Hilka's elaborate variorum edition of Chrétien's *Perceval* (Halle, 1932), the need for a handy and easily usable text has become increasingly apparent. Moreover, both Hilka and Gottfried Baist before him had used Bib. Nat. fonds fran. 794 (A) as basic manuscript,—a defensible choice, albeit scarcely the best. In fact, in *Tradition manuscrite des romans de Chrétien de Troyes* (Paris, 1939: pp. 252, 292), Alexandre Micha found that significant individual variants in A are more than twice as numerous as in the manuscript (T) which Roach has wisely selected.

Any appraisal of Roach's edition must, of course, be limited by the specific objectives which he has clearly indicated. In particular, it is *students* "à qui cette édition est principalement destinée" (p. x). The critical text of T is, as intended, a faithful and accurate transcript, with only such emendations as preclude "contradiction violente avec les autres mss ou avec la structure interne et le sens du récit." In this connection (p. xi), Roach dictates to himself a common-sense

procedure which has been thought of all too infrequently by other editors. At least part of his "directive" calls for repeating: "L'erreur (i. e., in the basic manuscript) est souvent apparente et, ce qui est également important, la cause de l'erreur l'est généralement aussi. Cependant, lorsque l'un de ces deux éléments: *nature* de l'erreur ou *cause* de l'erreur, n'est pas clair, une attitude prudente et conservatrice est requise de l'éditeur." On this basis, Roach usually abandons T whenever its reading is unsupported elsewhere, but adheres to it when "T et quelques-uns au moins des autres mss offrent une leçon acceptable." This policy should serve as good counsel to any future editor of Old French texts.

The seven-page introduction attempts nothing beyond listing the poem's fifteen manuscripts (plus two fragments), giving references to previous editions and translations, pointing out a few current titles for the reader interested in the origins and interpretations of the Grail legend, and indicating the mechanics which govern the edited text and critical apparatus. Moreover, while Roach has included an index of the proper names, there is no glossary, inasmuch as the Foerster-Breuer *Wörterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes* (Halle, 1933) already fulfills this requirement (verses are numbered in Roach's edition as in Hilka's). The thirty pages of textual notes are concerned almost exclusively with manuscript readings and syntactical details: and these are excellent, as, e. g., for vv. 4389, 4990, 7259, 8531.

The "inclusions and exclusions" which prevail in Roach's edition have been judiciously determined, so that his *Perceval* should meet the every wish of those whose concern is the scholarly accessibility of the poem today. As for the structure and accuracy of the edited text proper, one need only recall that in this regard Roach enjoys a reputation second to none. For the punctuation-minded, the only solace recommended here comes by way of invitation to make verse-by-verse comparison with Hilka.

Others will disagree perhaps about editorial details or about textual interpretation, but, for the purposes of this notice, only the slightest reservations want mention. Roach's edition was in print too soon for inclusion (p. xiv) of two capital studies in his list of recent contributions to Grail commentary: Myrrha Lot-Borodine, "Le Conte del Graal de Chrétien de Troyes et sa présentation symbolique," *Romania*, LXXVII (1956), 235-288; Sister M. Amelia Klenke, "The Spiritual Ascent of Perceval," *Studies in Philology*, LIII (1956), 1-21. Particularly, one could wish that Roach had not omitted his own view of Chrétien and the Grail problem, as outlined in *Romance Philology*,

ix (1956), 313: his dispassionate statement should be taken to heart by partisans, Celticist and anti-Celticist alike. Interpretation of the *Conte du Graal* has never justified controversy along Celticist or non-Celticist lines as such: too much heat and unruly passion have been generated by latter-day confusion of the poem's source problems with its actual twelfth-century meaning. On this whole question, incidentally, the favorite comment which I have encountered has, until now, been hidden in the recesses of personal correspondence: "It is regrettable, but unfortunately true, that the sponsors of the two main theories about the origins of the Grail legend seem to impute to those who disagree with them infractions, not only of their own self-formulated ten commandments, but also of most of those attributed by Exodus to God."

One further minor reservation: Roach's note to v. 3675 refers to Alexander Bell's view (as of 1934) that *Cothoatre* corresponds to Middle English *Scottewatre* (= Firth of Forth), a hypothesis accepted by R. S. Loomis in *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes* (New York, 1949: p. 408), as well as by W. A. Nitze and H. F. Williams, *Arthurian Names in the Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes* (Berkeley, 1955: p. 291). Actually, since the "lake" by which *Cothoatre* is located is undoubtedly the Sea of Galilee, the most convincing identification is with *Kattath* or *Qattat* (Josue xix, 15), as proposed a decade ago in the brilliant chapter by Urban T. Holmes, Jr., "A New Interpretation of Chrétien's *Conte del Graal*," *Studies in Philology*, XLIV (1947), 468.

For nearly twenty years, Roach has been securing rightful recognition as this country's foremost Arthurian editor in Old French. His 1956 presentation of the most controversial of all mediaeval French Grail texts will only reaffirm his pre-eminence in the field.

University of California,
Berkeley, California

EDWARD B. HAM

Luis Vélez de Guevara, *El Embuste acreditado*, ed. Arnold G. Reichenberger (Granada: Univ. of Granada, 1956. 364 pp.). ADMIRER and praised by his contemporaries for his dramas, Luis Vélez de Guevara was seemingly quickly and almost totally forgotten by succeeding generations. Some seven years before the end of his life in 1644 he claimed to have written four hundred comedias. The figure need not be taken as exact, but even when allowance is made for some exaggeration it remains a bit surprising that considerably fewer than

one hundred of his plays have survived. A good part of the loss may be attributed to the fact that during the author's lifetime so few of his plays were published. Vélez, unlike some of his fellow dramatists, did not enjoy the satisfaction of seeing any of his works collected into a volume or volumes under his own name; the few (approximately a dozen, so far as we know) that did appear in print were issued in volumes of plays by various authors and published in various cities. And among the latter, oddly enough, Madrid, the one in which he spent the better part of his life, does not figure. Unfortunate, too, was Vélez in the preservation of his autograph manuscripts (only four survive) and the manuscript copies of other plays are often of such poor quality as to render obscure or uncertain the author's real merit. So, also, in many instances, with those plays that have survived only in print. Such neglect and prolonged oblivion inevitably tended to make impossible any accurate appreciation of Vélez de Guevara as a dramatic author.

Though progress has been slow, thanks to the efforts of various scholars the situation in recent years has become somewhat better. Known copies of Vélez's plays, in some instances exceedingly rare, are widely scattered and so not easily accessible for a study of his total surviving dramatic output; but modern editions of individual plays have appeared from time to time and have thus made possible a better understanding of one of Spain's most interesting and talented dramatic writers of the *Siglo de Oro*. Notable among such contributions is the edition and study at hand.

We shall not attempt to enter into all the detail that Dr. Reichenberger's edition of *El embuste acreditado* might well justify. Because of the relative scarcity of copies, the play (known also by at least a half dozen other titles, e. g., *Otro demonio tenemos*, *Los encantos de Merlín*, etc.) has remained among the less widely known of Vélez's dramatic compositions. Students of the *comedia* now have not only the text itself in a carefully prepared critical edition, they have as well an admirably detailed study and analysis of the play and a significant commentary thereon.

In his Introduction (pp. 7-109), Dr. Reichenberger, after giving the bibliography of *El embuste acreditado*, analyzes the plot and versification, with particular attention to the latter's strophes and their suitability to the passages in which they are employed. Next come briefer but adequate discussions of: (a) "Vélez y Cervantes. Fecha del 'Embuste'" (the editor finds close contact between the Clavileño episode in *Don Quijote* and Rosimunda's flight through the air, and

for the date, "... 1615-1618, posiblemente 1617-1618"); (b) "Crítica de 'El embuste acreditado'" (Cotarelo: "No se concibe argumento más absurdo y ridículo"—Spencer-Schevill: "... la sitúan entre las mejores comedias novelescas"—Dr. Reichenberger: "(1) nuestro autor logra crear una trama en la que hay equilibrio, variación y movimiento; (2) varios de los caracteres están trazados con habilidad . . . (3) aunque el humor . . . tiene un tinte satírico, no llega a la amargura ni a la mordacidad," with elaboration of these points), and (c) "Vélez y lo sobrenatural."

The text of *El embuste acreditado* has been preserved, with varying degrees of accuracy, in both printed and manuscript form. The first printed edition, so far as is known, appeared in *Quinta Parte de comedias escogidas* . . . , Madrid, 1653, and its text Dr. Reichenberger takes as the basis for his own. From six other printed editions and from a manuscript in Parma (which Restori thought possibly an autograph) the editor records the variants, introduces occasional emendations or corrections, and incorporates some forty-eight verses not found in his basic text. On the whole, the reader can hardly be other than surprised to see how little, fundamentally, the manuscript and the editions printed subsequent to that of 1653 contribute to the improvement of the latter's text. That all known editions are complete one may well doubt. The text as constituted by Professor Reichenberger has only 2,330 lines, a figure far short of the 3,000 verses, approximately, regarded as normal for a *comedia*. Vélez could, however, fall short of the norm, for one of his autographs shows only 2,442 verses as against something more than 3,000 in each of the other three. It is upon reading the play that the conviction becomes strong that something is missing, particularly in Act I.

The scholar fond of exhaustive and detailed annotation will find satisfaction in the learned commentary which Dr. Reichenberger has provided on the text of *El embuste acreditado*. Therein he does not restrict himself to the more or less conventional topics (syntax, vocabulary, literary, historical, mythological and geographical allusions and references, etc.); in addition, there are penetrating observations on the motivations and psychological reactions and processes of the characters, and, since in some instances Vélez's authorship has been questioned, there are abundant citations drawn from other works of his in corroboration of his syntactical and lexicographic practices. Vélez's language could be, and on occasion was, complicated and difficult, and *El embuste* is fair witness to the fact. Another aspect of the commentary will not pass unnoticed by students of the *comedia*:

the numerous parallels drawn from *La Estrella de Sevilla*. Who wrote this masterpiece? Despite various efforts, scholarship has not yet found a generally accepted answer. On the question Professor Anibal once expressed the opinion that "an intensive study of Luis Vélez de Guevara might lead to illuminating material of great moment." Dr. Reichenberger lays no claim to establishing Vélez as the author of *La Estrella*, but his introduction to and commentary on *El embuste acreditado* are a splendid step forward in the desired "intensive study." It is to be hoped that others equally significant will not be too long postponed.

Most fittingly, to the late Professor Anibal, guide and mentor of the editor, "Se le ofrece esta edición como homenaje de afectuosa memoria, con la esperanza de que no sea del todo indigna de su maestría." The editor may well feel confident that Professor Anibal could and would have felt honored by this excellent offering of his former pupil.

Indiana University

JOHN M. HILL

Henrik Becker, *Spottlied, Märchen und Heldenlied vom Rosengarten* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1955. 160 pp.). IN the year 1893 Georg Holz (Leipzig), whom Becker acknowledges as his teacher (oddly enough, he was mine too), published his scholarly edition of *Die Gedichte vom Rosengarten zu Worms*, distinguishing texts A, C, D, F, and P, and printing A, D, and F, with full *Lesarten* and an introduction of over 100 pages.

Reading these various versions with (I assume) an attempt to find grounds for their deviation from each other, Becker came to the conclusion that the earliest *Rosengarten* was a *Spottlied*, a savage mockery of the whole *Frauendienst*, "Enthüllung der ritterlichen Kampfsitten in ihrer ganzen Hohlheit." He points out the essential absurdity of bloody combats in the midst of a rose garden, he observes the mock made of Siegfried, fleeing ignominiously from Dietrich and being saved by Kriemhild, who covers him with her wide sleeve; and he scores a point in his analysis of the introduction and extravagant treatment of the battling monk Ilsân.

So effective was this ridicule (he contends) that the knightly party responded by reissuing the same poem as a *Heldenlied* with both additions and subtractions, turning defeat into victory—for the time being. Only later (presumably after knighthood had lost its prestige)

did the *Spottlied* come back into public favor, as shown by many reprints.

Between these two main versions Becker distinguishes a *Märchen*, which however is imperfectly preserved, and which he thinks had no great circulation. It too, however, was intended to take the sting out of the travesty, by attempting "alles ins Romantische und Liebliche zu wandeln."

Taking Holz's edition as his foundation (but with corrections and conjectural wordings), Becker prints the *Rosengarten* in the three parallel forms of S, M, and H. This clever scheme reveals to the eye the major deviations and enables the reader to follow Becker's plan in detail; the case as a whole seems to me quite plausible.

My only quarrel with the work is the paucity of its apparatus and the lack of documentation, whereby a certain arbitrariness of procedure is masked. In the main, S follows Holz's A text, which he presumed to be the earliest version. But not infrequently Becker fails to follow Holz (e. g., 14-20, 41, 42, 48), and the first couplet of stanza 1107 is lacking in Holz's text and *Lesarten*; there is no way of finding out Becker's *modus operandi* in such cases. Without justifying comment on his part, one is led to suspect that he has chosen readings, or perhaps even supplied them, which will support his thesis.

Even more perplexity is caused by M and H as Becker prints them. No information is given as to the provenance of these stanzas, or as to the criteria whereby H is distinguished from S, and M from both of the others.

On page 27 I note 'Strofe' for 'Strophe' (used elsewhere), on page 160, 'Niebelungenliedes.' Minor verbal deviations in S from Holz's A are frequent enough to cast some doubt on Becker's accuracy.

Becker expresses the hope that a "grosse Aufgabe" of the *Rosengarten* may follow. If that is done, it should then be possible to give his theory a more searching critical scrutiny.

Stanford, California

BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN

George Fenwick Jones, transl., *Wittenwiler's Ring. Colkelbie Sow. Two Comic-Didactic Works from the Fifteenth Century* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1956. xiv + 246 pp. \$4.50. Univ. of North Carolina Studies in Germanic Languages and Literatures, 18). LATE in 1850 Adelbert Keller could introduce Ludwig Bechstein's now obsolete edition of Wittenwiler's *Der Ring*, published as vol. 23

of the "Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart," with the following words: "Das Gedicht der Ring, von welchem, wie es scheint, noch kein Literarhistoriker berichtet hat, erscheint hier zum erstenmal im Drucke." In the one hundred years and more which have elapsed since that time, important research, both textual and historical, has been devoted to the work and its author, the chief credit going to the Viennese scholar Edmund Wiessner, who in 1931 published a critical edition of the text according to the Meiningen manuscript (the only extant one), with an introduction and notes on lexicography and the manuscript, and in 1936 a three-hundred page commentary. Both volumes appeared in the Reclam "Deutsche Literatur" series, reihe 4, bde. 3 and 3a.

This belated appreciation of the work seems quite natural. Practically devoid of literary value, longish and encyclopedic in its scope, and naively obscene in many passages, it did not attract much attention until recent scholarship recognized its value as a sociological and cultural document. It is from this point of view too, that the present author, George Fenwick Jones, approaches the work. His service to scholarship is threefold. He has made the extensive poem, almost 9,700 lines long, available in a good modern English prose translation. He has provided, in what he calls an Exposition, a sixty-page commentary on numerous phases of the book, among which I would have welcomed a fuller treatment of the recurrence of the most significant of Wittenwiler's themes in the sixteenth century. Finally, he has checked and controlled Wiessner's textual and lexicographic findings and in some cases, at least, has come up with better solutions to problems.

We will consider each of these three points in order.

This is the first English translation ever to appear. The spot check which I have made indicates that Jones has performed his task in a scholarly, accurate manner. A sample (ll. 2351-72):

Unterm kränzle was verwunden / Ir härel sauber auf gepunden. / Der augen
hiet sei viereu, / So schön und also ziereu, / Daz mir jo des so nicht enwas, /
Ich schauwet in ein spiegelglas. / Sei hiet einn mantel, der was prait / Und
manich varw dar an gelait. / Sei tant in auf mit einer hand: / Er daucht mich
weiter dann ein land. / Ein kind sei an der andern truog: / Daz was so wun-
nechleich und chluog, / Daz ich alles ungemach / Verclait, wan ich es an
gesach. / In einer chirchen sei do sas / Auf dem alter, sam mir was. / Die was
gemalet über al / Mit zarten bildern ane zal; / Dar zuo hiet die selbig chilch /
Ein se umb sich mit hönk und milch. / Der was vil michel und auch gross; /
In sälder wuot er umb sei floss.

Under her wreath her hair was wound and neatly bound. She had four eyes, so beautiful and magnificent that I felt I was looking in a mirror. She had a cloak that was broad and had many colors set in it. She stretched it out with one hand, and it seemed to me longer than a land. In the other she carried a child that was so delightful and wise that I forgot all discomfort as soon as I saw it. It seemed to me she was sitting on the altar in a church which was painted all over with innumerable tender pictures. That same church also had a sea of honey and milk around it, which was vast and great and flowed around it with a blissful motion.

Jones's language is the English of today: "Knotz and Troll were regular guys" (p. 81, see also p. 101). — "the guy was too thin" (p. 83). In the first instances "regular guys" = *gsellen*; on p. 83 it equals *reck*. "If you don't cut that out" (p. 87) = *wilt sein nicht geraten bas*. "No wise man should come to council on his own" (p. 99) = *chain weiser chomen sol von im selber zuo dem rat*. The use of prose to render Wittenwiler's uninspired doggerels with their frequent forced rhymes certainly seems defensible. But when the author breaks out in an aubade, a rondeau, a madrigal, or the like Jones matches him, e. g. p. 23: "To serve her I have sworn indeed, / Although today she says me nay. / Because tomorrow I'll succeed, / My heart looks forward to that day," etc. Using prose proves an economy, too, for while Bechtold has 258 pages of text and Wiessner about 315, Jones requires only 130.

The Exposition and Appendix I on controversial points, both keyed to the text by a system of numbered paragraphs, present the most advanced stage of research on the subject of the poem and its author. Wittenwiler was probably not a nobleman, came from the region near St. Gall, and was not necessarily an older man when he wrote. He may have been an advocate at the episcopal court at Constance. Wiessner's date for the poem (between 1390 and 1405) is not controverted by Jones, nor does he adduce new sources for it in addition to those already known. There is much discussion of Wittenwiler's method and style and his treatment of the peasants. As for Wittenwiler's purpose, Jones agrees with most recent critics in ascribing a generally serious didactic and religious intention to him.

In a number of instances Jones definitely improves upon Wiessner's interpretation, as e. g. when he interprets *an dem gebett* (l. 3462) as "in their prayer" instead of "in the bridal bed"; *schloern* (2566) = "slut," not "veil"; and *chlainet* (l. 162) = "crest," not "banner." He is also much more sparing of emendations in the manuscript (of which he used a photostatic copy) than was Wiessner.

Besides Appendix I, there are also three others, which comprise quotations from and allusions to Scripture, a critical bibliography of 56 items, and an index and name list. Five appropriate illustrations serve as frontispieces.

While some may not regard it a happy thought on the part of Jones to include a translation of the little known fifteenth century Middle Scots poem *Colkelbie Sow* in this volume, I believe it adds a distinctive value to his work by making his study one in comparative literature. *Colkelbie Sow* too stems from the fifteenth century; it too is comic-didactic, with a serious purpose, although of course the two poems originated quite independently of each other.

The similarity between the two works, though not striking, is yet existent, and, as Jones states, one serves to throw light upon the other. Whoever is familiar with the *Ring* will not doubt, for instance, that *Colkelbie Sow* also has a serious purpose. And the brand of satire is the same in both works. In the case of this work too Jones has done a creditable editorial job, devoting twenty-three pages of commentary and explanation to a work which hardly comprises more than fifteen pages of text.

Father Fehrenbach's published Catholic University thesis on the *Ring* (1941) is justly appraised (p. 197), and Walter C. Kraft's microfilmed University of California thesis on its phonology (1951), which proved that the High Alemmanic work must have been copied by a Bavarian scribe, is deservedly noted (p. 198).

The presswork is excellent. I have noted only one misprint: Ermatinger (p. 197) has only one "t."

University of Cincinnati

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

Hans Zeller, *Winckelmanns Beschreibung des Apollo im Belvedere* (Zurich: Atlantis, 1955. 246 pp. Zürcher Beiträge zur deutschen Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte, 8). IN the year 1764, after having resided in Rome for almost nine years, Winckelmann wrote: "Ich glaube, ich bin nach Rom gekommen, denjenigen, die nach mir sehen werden, die Augen ein wenig zu öffnen." The truth of this claim, which (characteristically) is at once modest and sweeping, has been amply borne out by time, regardless of the exact meaning one attributes to it. Evidently, "die Augen öffnen" is an ambiguous term, capable—even within the figurative sense—of two interpretations, one

more, one less specific. In our age of picture books with little or negligible text, an intelligent author can open our eyes to the beauty of a work of art by choosing the right kind of photograph, just as he can "close" them with the wrong kind, particularly in the case of a work of sculpture. In earlier times when the blessings—and the curse—of photography were not available and when the illustrations of works of art were left to craftsmen whose efforts frequently jar on our over-sensitive organs, this kind of eye-opening had often to be left to verbal description, and here, too, the taste and the training of the writer mattered decisively. But in order to be comprehensive, this kind of eye-opening must be supplemented by another which really applies to the *mind's* eye and to the heart. This operation lay, and lies, in the hands of the inspired and inspiring speaker or writer, *pace* the attempts to find a "direct road" to art which our age is quite justifiably making. It stands to reason that this approach is even less objective than the photographic or purely descriptive one, and the biases and prejudices of the generation to which the author belongs as well as his personal temperament will lend a highly subjective flavor to his interpretations. But this peril is counterbalanced by the chance of forming, in the same breath as it were, a distinguished work of literature which may be read by us with the same pleasure and profit as by generations before us and after us, regardless even of our belief in some of the most essential points the writer wished to make. Our eyes are still being opened—to new vistas if not to the more palpable aspects of the object in question.

Winckelmann's various drafts of a description of the *Apollo Belvedere* exemplify both categories of eye-opening in the most enlightening fashion. Painstakingly exact delineations of single features alternate with far-reaching generalizations in the first (Florentine) draft; in the following (Paris) drafts, descriptive elements were subordinated to the panegyric presentation of the essence of the work, and many of them eliminated; in the final condensed version, which appeared in the "Geschichte der Kunst," his ambition to write on this, his favorite Greek masterpiece "im höchsten Stil," by lavishing on it "fast die Mühe . . . die ein Heldengedicht erfordert," has been fully realized, although with some further loss of significant detail. In spite of Karl Philipp Moritz's spirited objections and Heinse's qualms, it is a passage which to us, who are no more willing to consider the *Apollo Belvedere* "das höchste Ideal der Kunst unter allen Werken des Alterthums," still represents some of the essence of in-

spired analysis of a work of sculpture, in addition to being—or shall we say, by virtue of being?—a masterpiece of eighteenth century literature.

The present volume begins with a careful investigation of the origin of the various versions and then proceeds to a minute description of the manuscripts of the drafts, which together with the final version are reprinted on an inserted supplement, thus enabling the reader to have the texts before him all the time while following the author's discussion. There follows a penetrating analysis of the language, the literary sources and the historical locus of the texts, joined by no less useful chapters on the "Begriff des Ideals" and "Deutung." The latter is subdivided into discussions of contemporary echoes of Winckelmann's description, the main elements of its literary style, the creation of a new prose style by Winckelmann, its relation to tradition, the problem of describing works of art, Winckelmann's "ganzheitliche" view of art, and his relationship to Epicurus. The author is thoroughly at home in the eighteenth century, and his treatment of this comparatively short but extremely important piece of literature betrays a catholicity of interests and soundness of knowledge which deserve high praise.

Oberlin College

WOLFGANG STECHOW

Robert T. Clark, Jr., *Herder His Life and Thought* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1955. vi + 501 pp. \$6.50). THIS recent study of J. G. Herder as of "one of the commanding figures of European culture" by Professor Robert T. Clark puts a reviewer somewhat on the spot. On the one hand a cursory reading of the handsomely made-up book seems to disclose a commendable, at times impressive scholarship on the part of the author, and an unusual wealth of pertinent facts. On the other hand a closer scrutiny reveals not only numerous inadequacies, gaps, and errors in details, but also a challenging but rather vexatious general thesis which attributes to Herder a greater degree of originality than has hitherto been assumed. Whether the fact that it is in English adds distinction to the work, as many will take for granted, is open to dispute, although a new comprehensive Herder biography for readers familiar only with this language is doubtless gratifying.

The whole scope of the book is affected, however, by its genus which

apparently was determined by the class of readers for which it was principally designed: the American graduate student. The limitations of this audience are observable in some diluted and simplified presentations of facts, as well as in some talking down to the reader, and also in the lack of new and original vistas beyond the results of the Herder research of the past half century. In other words Professor Clark, despite his disagreements with other Herder scholars, does not address himself to fellow researchers in the field of 18th-century German literature. But on the credit side of the ledger can be recorded a fairly successful blend of biography and intellectual history, buttressed with the formal paraphernalia of learning, i. e. a considerable number of notes and an extensive bibliography, as well as some excellent summaries of individual works by Herder.

Whether the major thesis of the book has been established will be left to the specialists, particularly to the Hamann specialists. This reviewer will confine himself to pointing out—though quite unsystematically—some, not all, of the inadequacies in details and facts. Since a publication of this kind has a fair chance of being reissued, there should be ample opportunity for corrections and additions.—Beginning with the “Bibliography” (pp. 455-78) it is evident that what the author has offered under this title is not an exhaustive bibliography, despite the fact that it covers almost 23 printed pages, but rather a selective list of titles. Principally intended for documentation of the main account it also lists a number of studies the author obviously did not consult. Strangely enough Goedeke's *Grundriss*, (“the logarithm table of the literary historian”), vol. iv, is not listed in the latest edition, the third (1916), nor is there any reference to *Im Geiste Herders*, ed. by Erich Keyser, 1953, the most important and complete supplement to Goedeke for the years 1916-53 (pp. 268-305). Under section 3 “Correspondence and other Primary Biographical Works” Wilhelm Frels's indispensable *Deutsche Dichtershandschriften* etc. (a publication of the MLA!) is missing as are several publications of significant letters from and to Herder (e.g. Friedrich Münter, F. L. Schröder, F. L. W. Meyer). Particularly surprising is the omission of the Herder letter of June 18, 1784 to Christian Gottlob Heyne (printed in the *GR*, 1940), in which reference is made to a third call to a theological chair at the University of Göttingen.

Of the many passages which struck this reviewer as especially diluted, probably due to the genus of the book, were those dealing

with Johann Valentin Andreae (no mention is made of his disciple and Herder's forerunner, Johann Amos Comenius) as well as those treating Pierre Bayle and Jean Paul Richter, or the two meager references to François Hemsterhuis. Some of the characterizations of Wieland (e.g. p. 247) and even of Hamann and his "friend" J. A. Starck are rather surprising, and one wonders how much Professor Clark really profited from Sengle's and Nadler's biographies of these men. To call Johann Melchior Goeze, Lessing's theological opponent, "unethical" (p. 284) is repeating a stereotyped but obsolete bias of 19th-century German Liberalism. How can there be a "conspiracy of silence" in regard to R. E. Raspe (p. 114) when anybody may find a lengthy and reliable biographical account of him in *DNB*, vol. 47? The *Fortsetzung* of Lessing's *Ernst und Falk* consisted of the fourth and fifth and not of the third and fourth dialogues, and presumably they were *not* published by Campe. The extraordinarily lean account of Goethe's early intellectual growth (pp. 123-24) is almost irritating. No word is said of his friendship and correspondence with E. Th. Langer, so necessary for an understanding of the young poet's pietistic "conversion," or of his preoccupation with alchemy, so admirably presented recently in R. D. Gray, *Goethe the Alchemist*, 1952. Occasionally the comments on Herder's writings amount to nothing more than a recorded title (p. 248 f.). The evidently ineradicable confusion of Mrs. Elizabeth Montagu, the author of the essay on Shakespeare's genius (p. 151), with Lady Mary Wortley Montagu is kept alive in the index (p. 495).

The most seriously erroneous and disappointing portions of the book are the ones concerned with 18th-century German freemasonry. This is all the more regrettable since in Herder's personal masonic history *one* answer can be found to the problem of his "Rationalism." For his account of Herder's connections with freemasonry Professor Clark relies on out-of-date and heavily biased masonic publications. When all European freemasonry started in England where existing secret societies of craftsmen were transformed into speculative lodges of accepted free-masons and united into a Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons in 1717, how could a masonic lodge of this new kind be established at Königsberg, Prussia, in the same year (p. 42)? How could Leibniz, who died in 1716, be a member of a masonic lodge (p. 43)? Such misstatements are, of course, only minor blemishes.

Far more consequential is the fact that Professor Clark does not realize how ambiguous the phenomenon of 18-century German free-

masonry was. He—like many others before him—falls for one of the propaganda lines by masonic authors that only the masonic lodges strictly following the enlightened rationalistic ideology of the original English freemasonry were genuine. This would make aberrations and regrettable distortions of the masonic systems, oriented along anti-rational and mystical lines, which sprang up less than 20 years after the first German lodge was founded in Hamburg. The historical truth is that the latter represented a very serious reform movement in favor of a return to medieval Christian tenets, symbolized in the "high degree" rituals, which forced the "English" lodges into the background and deprived them of almost all influence for a quarter of a century. Thus, maintaining that during the 18th century German freemasonry was one of the most important channels through which the English Enlightenment spread to Germany (p. 288), or that in the 1760's and 1770's the German masonic lodges were closely allied with the educational and literary strivings of the Enlightenment (p. 160) is garbling the true historical development. To refer to Wieland in support of the second assertion is really absurd, because Wieland did not become a freemason until 1808. The lumping together of "Rationalists, Freethinkers, and Freemasons (p. 43) leads to a grievous error.

After the "Strict Observance," the strongest mystical masonic order in Germany, had renounced in 1782 the legend of a direct descent of freemasonry from the Knight Templars, the pendulum started to swing back. Various "reform" systems emerged to revert German masonic lodges to their original enlightened principles, or to win over their members into the strongly rationalistic Order of the Illuminati, in existence already since 1776. Herder, initiated into a Strict Observance lodge at Riga in 1766, remained in close contacts with this mystical masonic persuasion for about 10 years (cf. his letter to F. L. Schröder, one of the leading enlightened "reformers," of Nov. 23, 1800), but did not participate in the "work" of the Weimar lodge, which suspended activities in 1782 and stayed dormant for over 25 years. Like his friend J. J. Bode, for instance, he had become suspicious of secret mystical orders. In 1783 when the Illuminati had reached their apogee as the strongest attacking force against mysticism Herder together with Bode, Duke Carl August, Goethe, and other Weimar courtiers became one of the most dedicated members of this Order. In addition to the Weimar Illuminist colony the two neighboring courts of Gotha with Duke Ernst II and his brother

August and of Erfurt with Karl Anton von Dalberg, Governor for the Elector of Mainz, were the most influential strongholds of the Illuminati. The membership in this Order of the princes of Gotha as well as of Dalberg, all close friends of Herder's, may answer some of Professor Clark's questions (pp. 288, 449). Only a few years later the Order of the Illuminati fell victim to intrigues of obscurant clerical powers, but Herder assisted F. L. Schröder in the composition and perfection of his reform ritual three years before the end of his life.

So much for Herder and German freemasonry, a topic which deserves a new and thorough treatment. The necessary preparatory investigations for such a study have been available for some time. Perhaps it would be unfair, however, to expect that Professor Clark should have consulted two extraordinarily valuable French works, the one Paul Vernière's *Spinoza et la pensée Française*, the other Roland Mortier's *Diderot en Allemagne*, both published in 1954. They would probably have induced him to revise his statements on Diderot (whom Herder never met personally) and on 18th-century Neo-Spinozism, which was quite different from the original Spinozism.

As was suggested at the beginning of this review a professional reader of Professor Clark's Herderbook will look in vain for problems so far very rarely debated by Herderscholars but present and urgent just the same. Some of these important problems are those related to an understanding of Herder's own language, as the essential basis for a better interpretation of his works. His individual vocabulary, his personal style compared to that of his period are in need of clarification. How important and revealing such semantic studies can be, may be shown by Edna Purdie's paper "Some Word-Associations in the Writings of Hamann and Herder" (*Willoughby-Festschrift*, 1952; a title not included in the Clark bibliography), an inquiry clearly demonstrating Herder's possibilities and limitations of expression with just a few very important words. A chapter on Herder's language and style would have made it possible for the more critical reader to overlook even some of the oversimplifications of a sometimes too skilful *ars combinatoria* in this book.

Can we consider it the definitive English work on Herder? Certainly not. Not that it is a bad book. It is a very useful book of its kind.*

Harvard University

HEINRICH SCHNEIDER

* This review was written several months before Professor Clark's untimely death.

for
the
as
of
ter
ant
ion
of

ich
ory
ne.
ark
ks,
her
54.

on
ury
sm.
nal
ms
ent
ted
asis
ury,
of
can
ons
ift,
iry
res-
er's
ical
nes

nly
d.*

R

nely

otes

I

S

W
S
G
in
o
re
se
n

I

V
a
l
c
"t
S

I

S
M
t
c
l
s

Four Benchmarks in Criticism

STUDIES IN HUMAN TIME

By Georges Poulet, translated by Elliott Coleman

When *Studies in Human Time* was published in France, it was awarded the Prix Sainte-Beuve, the Dürchon Prize in Philosophy of the French Academy, and the Grand Prize of the Syndicate of Critics in Paris. Now, with the addition of an important new chapter on American authors, this brilliant and authoritative work of literary criticism has been translated for the English-speaking reader. French reviews were unstinting in their praise of this revolutionary method of philosophical criticism: "A masterwork." *La Croix*. "It could very well reshape the methods of literary criticism." *Le Soir*. 384 pages \$5.00

ISHMAEL. By James Baird

What, in our time, is the relationship between art and religious consciousness? To arrive at his answer, the author examines the work of some twenty recent writers—led by Melville—who created a system of symbols referring to the primitivistic cultures of the Orient as opposed to the Christian cultures of Western man.

"It is quite a brilliant piece of work, but brilliance is not really its most important trait. It is, I think, a profound book . . . a truly philosophical study of literature." *Susanne K. Langer*. 468 pages \$5.50

MALLARMÉ: Selected Prose Poems, Essays, and Letters

Translated with Introduction by Bradford Cook

Stéphane Mallarmé, the leader of the French Symbolist movement, has been widely known and appreciated for his poetry in countries outside of France. Now, for the first time, it is possible for the English-speaking reader to have access to Mallarmé's critical writings on literature, music, theater, ballet, and individual artists. These critical writings include the most important, most original, and often the most beautiful pronouncements on art that French literature possesses. The translations are faithful to both the elegant style and the meaning of the extremely difficult French original. 200 pages \$4.00

THE ARTIST AS CREATOR. By Milton C. Nahm

What is the place of human freedom in the arts and fine arts? To what extent does the artist freely create, and to what extent is he a technician limited by his tools? These basic questions of aesthetics and the philosophy of art form the main theme of Professor Nahm's new book. In it he investigates the artistic process of creation, as opposed to the act of appreciation which he considered in his previous work, *Aesthetic Experience and its Presuppositions*. 364 pages \$5.50

THE *Johns Hopkins* PRESS



Baltimore 18,
Maryland

TURK'S FOUNDATION COURSE IN *Spanish*



*What I like best is the
combined practical and
cultural approach*

—These words of a west coast Spanish teacher are re-echoed many times in other teachers' appraisals.

An unusually careful presentation of grammar, much drill, and frequent review are planned for solid learning with a minimum of difficulty. Richly illustrated, graded cultural readings in Spanish touch upon all the Spanish-speaking countries, with emphasis on those cultural achievements that have had world influence.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

Sales Offices:

Atlanta 3

Englewood, N. J.

Dallas 1

Chicago 16

San Francisco 5

Home Office: Boston 16

SPECIAL COMBINATION OFFER

Modern Language Notes: regularly \$6.00 } **BOTH**
ELH regularly \$4.00 } **for**
\$8.00

To receive both journals at a saving of \$2.00, simply send us your order with remittance of \$8.00.

Note: This offer limited to individual subscribers;
not available to libraries and other institutions.



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMWOOD • BALTIMORE 18 • MARYLAND